THEOLOGY

VOL. XLII MAY, 1941 No. 251

EDITORIAL

IT would be a mistake to regard the vote in the House of Commons on April 1[1] as a signal vindication of our will as a nation to preserve our tradition of Sunday observance. It is more truly regarded as the result of a minor rearguard action by forces which have for long been in retreat, or perhaps of a posthumous twitch of the nonconformist conscience. Whereas M.P.s appear to have received an impressive number of postcards from their nonconformist constituents, Mr A. P. Herbert, who claims to have more Anglican clergymen among his constituents than any other Member, said that he had received no protest from any of them. Whether this means that they were not interested in the matter, or that they were wise enough to see that there is no reasonable case for rallying opposition at the particular point in dispute, we cannot tell. We are sure, however, that the obligations of Sunday observance need to be thoroughly reconsidered.

* * * * *

According to the Christian tradition the Lord's Day is to be set apart for worship and for rest. The tradition determined the social discipline of England, and even more conspicuously of Wales and Scotland, until about the end of the nineteenth century, since when it has undergone rapid dissolution. The national Sunday has ceased to be either worshipful or restful. A minority of the population still recognizes the duty of worship, though even there the sense of obligation varies indefinitely. To feel bound to attend church or chapel every Sunday is now to be a nonconformist in the sense of acknowledging an obligation

[1] By 144 votes to 136 a motion was carried which annulled an Order in Council which permitted the opening of theatres and music-halls on Sundays and the widening of the conditions under which cinemas may be opened.

which our society disregards and for which its public institutions (apart from the armed forces) make less and less provision. To suppose that in the proximate future the Christian tradition can be re-established in our national life and be expressed again in the general discipline of our society is unrealistic, and, while as citizens Christians need to consider which is the least of all possible evils they should advocate for the nation, their primary responsibility is to determine their duty as churchmen.

* * * * *

It can hardly be questioned that the duty of attendance at public worship on the Lord's Day is a permanent element in the Christian way of life; it is indeed an elemental part of churchmanship. Yet even church members are very vague as regards this duty both in what they believe and in what they practise. In these circumstances it seems idle for the spokesmen of the Church to address well-intentioned but indefinite appeals to *the nation* to worship God on Sundays. They would do better if they made it their business to define the nature and the form of the obligation which is incumbent on all church members, and if they took steps to build up a new corporate discipline in the Church. The Anglican tradition rightly lays equal emphasis on the Word and the Sacraments in its conception of public worship, and the duty of Sunday observance could without great difficulty be so redefined as to require all church members to join in (*a*) a liturgical service and (*b*) the preaching of the Gospel, wherever these may be had, every Lord's Day.

* * * * *

The idea of Sunday as a day of rest raises more formidable problems. There is a modern prejudice against the very notion of rest, which seems to be as common among Christians as among others. The current emphasis is all upon the provision of leisure not for rest but for recreation. We eschew every suggestion of inactivity in our descriptions of eternal life. No modern Christian can sincerely sing about " those endless Sabbaths the blessed ones see " which bring " to weary ones rest ". The universal prejudice is at first sight strange since it has developed at a time when men have increasingly accepted a passive, inactive, non-creative rôle not only in their work, which was seldom within their power to determine, but in their entertain-

ments, where they could discriminate. During war there is some modification of these conditions. Feverish, if ultimately destructive, activity becomes the order of the day for all. The idea of rest may, temporarily at least, regain some of its attraction.

* * * * *

The real problem is, however, deeper, and is unlikely to be transitory. Already there has been a bitter irony in the Church's exhortation to the unemployed to abstain from labour on one day in the week—or there would have been if the exhortation had been seriously meant and attentively received. If after the war progress is made with the constructive assimilation of the machine[1] and " the leisure state " begins to be realized, will not every day tend to become a day more of rest or recreation than of labour? This assumption appears to characterize most progressive thought. If we are not disposed to challenge it, must we not begin to reckon with the consequence that the traditional setting apart of Sunday as a day of rest will be rendered obsolete? The Homily *Of the Place and Time of Prayer* speaks indeed of the observance of a weekly day of rest as " appertaining to the law of nature ". It would seem that the incoming tide of technology may wash away some of the provisions of the law of nature. Perhaps no difficulty will be felt about this, since the concept of " the law of nature " has during the last hundred years conveniently slipped out of Anglican teaching.

* * * * *

We would suggest that the Christian mind would be as profitably occupied in asking awkward questions about Sunday observance in Britain as in airily planning a new world order in cosmopoltan terms. In the new

[1] Mr Lewis Mumford, in his fascinating book *Technics and Civilization*, shows the need for great discrimination in talk about " the machine age ". He distinguishes between the eotechnic period (1000-1750), the paleotechnic period (1750-1900), and the neotechnic period (1900-). These of course overlap, and Mumford maintains that many of our troubles are due to the fact that paleotechnic ideals " still largely dominate the industry and the politics of the Western world " (p. 213). He holds that in the neotechnic period, upon which we now are or might be embarking, man has the opportunity of assimilating the machine, whereas in the paleotechnic period he was assimilated by it. In his later book *The Culture of Cities*, he passes beyond the neotechnic period to a sketch of biotechnic society.

type of society, which so far is somewhat obscurely envisaged, what apart from worship will the duty of Sunday observance signify? We can conceive some possible positive answers—*e.g.*, that, whereas weekdays will be spent in specialist activities, Sundays should be set apart for the pursuit of general cultural interests, or that, whereas weekday occupations will separate the members of a family, Sunday occupations should unite them. A discussion group might begin with a critical examination of the way in which its members spend Sunday now, and of the obligations (if any) apart from that of worship which they still recognize. They could then go on to consider what duties as regards Sunday observance ought to determine the Christian conscience in the present age, and how the recognition of these can be secured in the life of the Church. Without such beginnings now, what hope is there of the restoration of a Christain social discipline on a national scale in the remoter future? We should welcome communications on this subject—not necessarily for publication—which would help us to pursue it further.

* * * * *

Note.—Since this was written, the Bishop of Sheffield has been reported as saying: "I believe that the best way of preserving Sunday as a day of rest and spiritual recreation and for worship might be for a five-day working week to become the general rule after the war.

"It is time for the leaders of the Churches to set before their members a simple and agreed statement how they should observe Sunday, and also the argument for 'a day of rest' in terms of social well-being, which might carry conviction to those who are not professing Christians." —*Daily Telegraph*, April, 1941.

Missions and Christology

It is but rarely that Theology contains references to the Church's mission to the non-Christian world, and it is, of course, true that while other Reviews specialize in this field Theology is primarily concerned with the subject which its title suggests. Yet nowhere, perhaps, can crucial differences of theological attitude be better exemplified than in the missionary sphere, differences, too, which have a directly practical bearing upon the scope and method of missionary work. It is, indeed, in the last resort the theological assumptions held consciously or unconsciously by missionaries and missionary bodies which must and do largely determine the missionary approach to non-Christian peoples: and it will not, perhaps, be out of place in this Review to illustrate the extent to which doctrinal considerations determine the direction of Christian missionary enterprise.

In this connexion the opening volume of the report of the Missionary Conference held at Tambaram in South India in December, 1938, on *The Authority of the Faith* is of special interest. The volume is wholly concerned with the appraisement by various speakers and writers, who took part in the Conference, of Dr Kraemer's great missionary classic, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World.* Indeed, it opens with a paper by Dr Kraemer himself in which he summarizes and defends the position, summed up as that of " Biblical realism," which he had expounded with great force and at great length in his book.

The book itself is a conspicuous example, in the field of missions to the heathen, of that swing of the theological pendulum with which the name of Karl Barth is associated. It represents, too, a natural reaction against methods of approach to non-Christians and non-Christian peoples which had been finding increasing advocacy in liberal circles of missionary thought and action. The purport, for example, of the conclusions drawn from a missionary tour by a number of interested laymen and published some years ago under the title *Rethinking Missions* had been to set Christianity alongside non-Christian religions as one among a number of spiritual interpretations of the world and of human life, and to advocate the missionary method of a common search for the truth by discussion between

representatives of Christianity and of other faiths. The volume, which had an American origin, was the extreme outcome of that growing knowledge and appreciation of the non-Christian religions, and of the high spiritual quality of many of their representatives, which had resulted from the comparative study of religions and from personal contact and experience on the part of missionaries and others. A not dissimilar standpoint was also taken at the Conference of the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem in 1928, where Christianity and the great non-Christian religions were not so much contrasted with each other as regarded as sharers in a common witness to the supremacy of the spiritual in human life and society, against the might and menace of a secular civilization, considered at that time the arch-antagonist of all that religion stands for.

And even where the non-Christian religions were not thus thought of as allies with Christianity against a common antagonist, there was an eager readiness to consider them as " tutors " to bring men and nations to Christ. There is in them, it was held, evidence of a genuine hunger for God of which, once He was proclaimed, Christ would be found the natural satisfaction. The great religions and their literary classics came to be considered as a præparatio evangelica equivalent to that which the Old Testament and the religion of the Old Testament had provided for those to whom the Gospel was first preached. Incomplete, indeed, in themselves, as the Old Testament was incomplete, the teachings and writings of the great non-Christian sages would find their natural fulfilment and interpretation in the New Testament, and for the peoples whose spiritual genius they expressed might well be substituted for the Old Testament as for them the appropriate background of their admission to the fellowship of Christ. The thought of Christ as one who came " not to destroy but to fulfil " was applied to fields far removed from the Mosaic law, and such a book as Farquhar's *Crown of Hinduism*, published in 1913, was a typically generous attempt to view the great religio-social system of India as ground containing spiritual seeds which would germinate and come to fruition through contact with the faith of Christ, and as characterized by spiritual aspirations and attainments which, baptized into Christ, would reveal new facets of the manifold wisdom of God.

It is against this liberal outlook on the missionary task and approach that Dr Kraemer sets himself both in his book

and the article referred to. For him there is a relation, " not of continuity, but of discontinuity " between the truth as it is in Christ and the non-Christian religions. It is a mistake, he maintains, and a mistake grounded in a false theology " to describe the religious pilgrimage of mankind as a preparation for or a leading up to a so-called consummation or fulfilment in Christ." Indeed, Christianity, or, as he would rather put it, the Christian revelation (for he contrasts the two), is so utterly and wholly *sui generis* and unique that, rightly considered, it forbids the missionary to look for any points of contact between the Gospel which he proclaims and the religious belief and practice of the non-Christian people to whom he is sent, or any foundation in the old on which he can build the new; and in a very interesting comparision between Clement of Alexandria, with his vindication of Greek philosophy as finding its consummation in the Gospel, and Karl Barth with his condemnation of religion and the religions as " essentially unbelief," because they do not " constitute a real response to God's self-manifestation in Jesus Christ," he claims that the latter as against the former is the only consistently Christian attitude. Between the Bible, as " describing and witnessing to God's creative and redemptive dealing with man and the world," and the classical non-Christian literatures there is, he would urge, nothing in common. In that series of divine actions and interventions on the plane of human history, of which the Bible is the record and the coming, life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are the consummation, are alone, he would tell us, to be heard the accents of the divine self-utterance to man, all other aspirations and achievements in the non-Christian religions being wholly of man, and not of God, examples, indeed, of " man's vain and presumptuous attempt to scale the heavens."

Such is the missionary standpoint, as defined in theological terms, of one of the outstanding missionary figures of to-day. And over against the standpoint of Dr Kraemer, and in strong contrast with it, may be set the missionary attitude and approach, and the doctrinal background from which it avowedly emerges, which is represented in the ninth chapter of Henry de Lubac's book *Catholicisme: les aspects sociaux du dogme* (Editions du Cerf, 1938). Here again it is the doctrinal factor which is decisive. Indeed, de Lubac expressly claims that it is not so much regard for the practical means best calculated to ensure success, as fundamental

doctrinal considerations, which determine the characteristic Catholic approach to the missionary task. It is, indeed, here in the sphere of doctrine that he differs so fundamentally from Kraemer. He would strongly contest that line of absolute discontinuity which the latter draws between the Gospel and the non-Christian religions; and not least would he repudiate Kraemer's contention that " theologically speaking ' nature,' ' reason ' and ' history ' do not, if we want to think stringently, afford preambles, avenues, or lines of development towards the realm of grace and truth as manifest in Jesus Christ." " The work of the Creator," says de Lubac, " however distorted by man, yet remains the natural and necessary preparation for the work of the Redeemer "; and " if in truth Christianity is divine, wholly divine, it is also in a sense human, wholly human, and it is by penetrating without rending the close-knit tissue of human history that it has come to transform man and renew the face of the earth." The teaching of the Church, as de Lubac represents it, is that there is no rigid dissociation between the realm of nature and the realm of grace, such as Kraemer postulates. It is the part of that revelation of grace which came by Jesus Christ not to displace, but to heal and to sanctify a nature which is itself not utterly corrupt, and which still, fallen though it be, carries traces of the divine purpose and the divine workmanship.

And this is the teaching which for de Lubac finds its counterpart and expression in the missionary sphere. With admirable lucidity he shows how closely the missionary approach to the non-Christian world is bound up with assumptions which run back to the doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Church. For if in our Lord's Person is found manhood whole and complete taken into God, so humanity, the humanity of the great non-Christian world, has that in it which is *capax Dei*, is the very material with which the Church is called to work and which, renewed and transformed, its mission is to incorporate into itself. The Church sees there evidence of the indwelling Logos, the Light which lighteneth every man, and finds in the reason and conscience and religious strivings of unregenerate humanity something to which appeal can be made in the name of Christ. It claims that there is a natural theology which provides the necessary and fitting substructure of revelation, and it seeks in accordance with its fundamental doctrinal presuppositions to go all possible lengths in adapting

its missionary approach to the environment, racial and cultural, in which it is made. It makes no profession of "cultural imperialism," and so far from seeking to set a uniform stamp on varying races and civilizations, its mission is "to purify and quicken each of them, to deepen and complete them, by the supernatural revelation of which it is the depositary."

As grounded in Catholic doctrine, the Catholic missionary method is thus one of practising a large and generous measure of accommodation to the human material on which the missionary works. A Robert de Nobili "makes himself a Brahman among the Brahmans," a Matthew Ricci takes rank among the lettered scholars of China, and the plea is quoted with approval that "Hinduism is a tree which will never fall, so long as the handle of the axe which attacks it is not drawn from its own wood." There are, of course, real dangers in the over-zealous application, on the part of the missionary, of this principle of accommodation to the existing philosophies and customs of non-Christian peoples, dangers of incorporating into the body of the Church undigested and unregenerate heathen elements, dangers which it is probably true to say that Roman Catholic missionary enterprise has not altogether avoided. For Kraemer is profoundly right in his insistence on the truth "that in Christ all things become new, because He is the crisis of all religions"; and while the principle holds good that the missionary aim is that of fulfilment rather than that of destruction, that of taking up and incorporating into Christ and the Church the non-Christian peoples and the natural excellences and gifts already found among them, there is at the same time the need of the most watchful discrimination to ensure that what is so accepted has been rendered assimilable to its new environment by a redemptive purge which rejects the dross and retains the gold. It is only with this proviso that the saying of Newman quoted by de Lubac holds good: "It is objected: these things are found among pagans, therefore they are not Christian; we on the contrary prefer to say these things are in Christianity, therefore they are not heathen."

The examples of missionary standpoint thus drawn from two eminent writers, the one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, are sufficient to show how deeply doctrinal presuppositions affect the missionary aim and way of approach. The insistence of Kraemer on the

complete breach between the Christian missionary's message and the non-Christian world of thought and life in which it is delivered, and the equal insistence of de Lubac on the inherent God-given worth of that same non-Christian world, with all its darkness and imperfection, run back to two sharply contrasted theologies, and in particular to two sharply contrasted conceptions of Christ and of the Church. And perhaps the contrast between the two cannot be better expressed than in the words of Canon Quick in the October (1940) issue of THEOLOGY: " The real point at issue is whether the historical revelation of redemption, foretold in the Old Testament, and given in Jesus Christ, is, in and by itself, a closed and self-sufficient system of knowledge concerning God, or whether it is itself to be recognized as the complement of another revelation given in the reason and conscience of man and never effaced, however confused and darkened by sin." The former would appear to be the standpoint of Dr Kraemer, and the latter that of Fr de Lubac, and in each case the doctrinal standpoint is emphasized as ultimately determining what should or should not be the way of missionary approach to the non-Christian world.

And if, in conclusion, we turn to Anglican missionary enterprise and the aim and method for which it stands, there can be little question with which standpoint it is most in sympathy. It may be true that about that enterprise there is a characteristic pragmatic tendency and the lack of a clearly thought out and defined theological basis. Yet that in fact it rejects the sharp dichotomy represented by Dr Kraemer, and is the expression of a Catholic conception of the relation between nature and grace, of the Incarnation and the Church, is abundantly clear. Its attitude cannot, perhaps, be better illustrated than by reference to the second of the contributions to *Essays Catholic and Missionary*, published in 1928, the essay on the presentation of the Gospel to the greater religions, by the distinguished Islamic scholar L. E. Browne. His justification of the Church's missionary enterprise is the finality of Christianity, which itself, he claims, rests on the fact, not that it is a philosophy and order of life self-sufficient and complete, but that it is " the perfect synthesis," and as such is unique in its capacity for incorporating into itself " all that is best from every quarter "; and he quotes, with approval, the dictum of Dr Rashdall: " This capacity of absorbing into itself elements of spiritual life which were originally independent of it is not a defect

of historical Christianity, but one of its qualifications for being accepted by the modern world as a universal, an absolute, a final religion."

It would not, indeed, be difficult to give examples, especially from the results of missionary work amongst primitive peoples, of this very capacity of the Gospel for preserving from extinction elements of native culture which otherwise would have perished and for finding room for them, renewed and transformed, in a Christian social order; nor perhaps can the missionary attitude, characteristic of the Church of England, be better expressed than in the words of the Prefatory statement, Indian Church Constitution, also quoted by L. E. Browne: "We have inherited the riches of the nations which have before us been gathered into the Church, the riches of wisdom and knowledge which they had from the Light which lighteneth every man, and look to discern other rays of that same Light in the high thoughts and aspirations of the nations which are yet to be gathered in." There is no question of the Christology which underlies this declaration.

P. A. Micklem.

The Secular and the Religious

If this were a sermon and not an essay, it would have a text; and if it had one, the text would be "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the round world and they that dwell therein." For it concerns the religious and the secular realms of life, and the labour of those who engage in both of them. And, to a Christian, it is clear that it is the Lord, the Creator-God, who is the principle of unity holding these two areas together, the Lord who is Himself the origin and the goal of all the labour which is performed in either and in both of them.

Now it is obvious from the very terms found in our heading that when we discuss the relationship of the religious and the secular, we are assuming that these are distinct realms of human experience, no matter how closely we may consider them to be associated one with the other. Perhaps we may begin our discussion, then, by saying that there are two distinguishable levels in our human experience—the religious and secular—which we must now proceed to define.

Tentatively, let us assert that the religious level is that whole area of human experience in which thought and action are related to God, with a more or less completely conscious sense of His presence, purpose and power. This area will include at its centre the religious, strictly speaking, by which I mean that actual worship of and communion with God which often goes by the name of "religious experience." I do not suggest, however, that this is limited to mysticism; what I wish to suggest is that at the centre of the religious area is the sacramental, cult, worshipful act; or perhaps the personal communion with a God "who walks with me and talks with me"; or even the moral life when very religiously viewed—as "lived in the great Taskmaster's eye"—to be distinguished from the sheerly ethical. Radiating out from this strictly religious central point there is a whole range of human activity which is more or less consciously related to God and His purpose; I mean the things done and said and thought with God more or less in mind, as it were. On the other hand, there is the secular level, that area of human experience in which activity is carried on without any actual reference to God or strictly conscious experience of His presence. Here study is directed towards objects for their own sake, or work is done for purely natural or scientific ends, or concern is entertained towards human enterprise solely on the human level. The scientist, the artist often, the reformer, the humanist (in the sense, perhaps, in which Mr Frank Mather used to employ the term)—here are examples of the secularist in my present meaning. These are distinct levels, then, the religious and the secular: they may (so to say) be mutually inter-involved in human experience, but they can be conceived as at least relatively distinguishable.

It interests me personally to note a somewhat similar twofold relationship more generally true as between God and man. On the one hand, there is the realm of grace, freedom, personal experience, communion; on the other, there is the realm, no less God's, of law, force or coercion, impersonality, objective stuff. Man is placed in both of these relationships to God, and his knowledge of, experience of, and thinking about God must take account of both. And so it is, also, that any adequate understanding of human experience must find place for both the religious and the secular, since both are real and, on a Christian understanding, both of them come from the one God. Our

whole Christian understanding presupposes that one God: we have, as Christians, a general theistic background, and we have also a view of God as present, in some real sense, in the whole of life, permeating the whole universe, too—not confined to some single area conveniently labelled " religious." Our main question may, then, be approached: what relationship do these two areas have one to another, and how, *theologically* speaking, should one envisage their mutual involvement in the healthy Christian life?

I think that while it may be true to say that for God Himself " religion " is singularly unimportant amongst all the activities of man, it is more true to say that for us, and therefore for God as one who is concerned with the truest and best development of the personalities of His human creatures, religion is the most important of all human pursuits—religion, that is, when conceived and interpreted as the conscious relating of life to God, in prayer, in cult-act and in the more extended field of our experience. It is not all of our life, it is not the totality of human endeavour; but, as Mr Whitehead has pointed out, it is the religious experience, or the fact of the religious attitude, which redeems life from being a mere bagatelle into something of such significance and richness of meaning that it is worth living. The chaotic, changing, seemingly irrelevant details of life (what Professor A. E. Taylor has called " the one damned thing after another " aspect of our life) can only make sense and have some enduring value when fitted into a pattern or a design for living; and it is precisely that which is provided by religion with its relating of all of those details to the purpose of God. This will be along various avenues, since religion has three essential aspects: prayer and cult-act, where an *intended* relationship of social communion with God is enjoyed; dogma, where beliefs about Reality, about man, about their mutual involvement, are defined in order to give meaning to man's experience and his world; and conduct, where the beliefs, made rich and vital in cult experience, flow out into the practical matters of daily living. Religion, so understood, gives to the frail human creature a sense of direction, an *attitude to* his immediate and secular concerns, and yet an *altitude above* them which saves him from too complete immersion in their immediacy and succours him by restoring to him the knowledge of the ultimacy of other than secular things. Emerson said he could get along without the universe; I

think that was not quite Christian. The Christian sentiment rather was the old darky's, who said she " wore this world like a loose garment." The secular is not disregarded, neither is it discarded; it is used and enjoyed; but the religious is central because it gives the key truth, the integrated pattern, the design for living, by relating life to God, who is the centre of all being.

Having said so much, I must go on at once to insist that the secular is also supremely significant in its own right, and not merely by being, as it were, ancillary to religion. When God created the world (and I am not now inquiring into the mode of creation, interesting as that question is to one who has just finished reading Mr Laird's chapter on the subject in his Gifford Lectures), He created something that stood over against Him with a certain relative independence; with a God-given derived, but none-the-less real, existence of its own, and a right therefore to receive respect, interest and study by and for its own sake. So the secular, the study of the natural creation and of man, the inquiries into the nature of things and their functioning, the arts and sciences, etc., have their own true place, and are deserving of the attention of men, even when they are not consciously being related to the God who in any case is their Creator and their Sustainer. Some of us have the idea, or at least we act as if we entertained it, that when we do not attend to God, or think about Him in relation to His universe, He ceases to be; rather in the way in which a priest told me his congregation was profoundly shocked one Sunday when he said that even if no one believed in God or sought to be in communion with Him, God would still exist ! But the fact that we are not always relating ourselves, our pursuits, and the world in which we live, quite consciously to God, does not denigrate from the dependence of ourselves, our pursuits and the world upon God. Indeed, it is the relative impersonality, the self-containedness, the non-religious secularity, of things such as I have mentioned that provide the material, the dough, the lump, upon which the religious can work in its task of giving significance to life. A human life *all religious*, as von Hügel used to tell his niece, would be " sheer error," bereft of much of its true richness and beauty. The sun's rays, shining through particles in the atmosphere, make the glorious sunset; were there no dust, there would be no beauty. And since Christianity is a sacramental religion, it glories in

the secular, the worldly and fleshly, because, without being destroyed or totally changed, these can be used and made to express, just as they are but in their *true* nature, the highest of all meanings. The secular, the humanistic, are to be sought and studied for their own sake, because they are both created and sustained by God; and when this is done they will often enough manifest and declare that God.

But here we need another and perhaps even more important caution. This is implied in what I call the principle of the divine incognito. That the religious is supreme, as involving a more direct and (as it were) personal contact with God no Christian can doubt; but that the secular also discloses God no Christian can doubt either. This is true—yet that disclosure of God in and through, by and under the secular (to use terminology popular with certain theologians) is always incognito, always in disguise. No man hath seen God at any time. Woe to us if we seek impiously to break through the secular disguise, to penetrate the incognito, to find God *pure and direct* underneath the veil or behind the action. Dogmatically, this attempt has been condemned in connexion with the doctrine of the person of Christ. The Church declared at Chalcedon in 451 that the divine and human natures of Christ are distinct but inseparable; to find God in Christ, you must find God in manhood; if there is no mediation through manhood, then there is no God incarnate. That principle may be extended and applied to our own problem. God is in the secular, but God is always mediated by it, and therefore is always incognito.

An illustration may clarify my meaning here. Recently I heard Mr Koussevitzky conduct the Boston Symphony Orchestra in a magnificent rendition of Brahms' *First Symphony*. I sat enthralled by the beauty of the performance; I was overwhelmed by the manner in which the orchestra responded to the conductor's slightest direction, and especially swept away by the haunting strings of the opening of the last movement. There was sheer joy in it, yet the depth of human experience and sorrow. The next day I happened to return in memory to the evening in Carnegie Hall. And suddenly I said to myself, "That was God speaking to us, and we did not recognize Him." But a moment later I realized that to have thought specifically religious thoughts, to have tried to turn the whole æsthetic experience into a religious one, would have destroyed the

value of it all, robbed it of its autonomous dignity and beauty. And yet the fact that I can and do relate that music to God, and find whispered intimations of Him there, that it and my religion fit into a pattern and design of which the very heart and centre is belief in and communion with God, makes the whole experience a richer and deeper thing; and so life in all its complexity as in all its simplicity becomes a more meaningful matter for me. It is similar in all our high hours of secular endeavour and experience. To turn the delights of friendship into a self-consciously religious moment, the pursuit of scientific truth in the laboratory into a quite clearly articulated search for God under His own name, the study of a great poem into a religious exercise, would, I think, ruin each and all of those experiences. But not to be able to relate them *ultimately* to God, nor to know that *in the religious moment* they found their place and received a heightened significance in our retrospective look, would be to make them less than they might be—would, indeed, ruin them in yet another sense.

I think that this is true quite generally in the matter of the relationship of religious and secular. Hence my suspicion of the theologians who would seek to force science into certain specific theological patterns; hence my suspicion of the scientists who prattle so readily about God, as if they had found Him *in propriâ personâ* at the other end of their microscope; hence my feeling that Laplace was correct in saying, in response to Napoleon's question, that he had no need for the theistic hypothesis. At that point, and in that connexion, he *had* no need for it; although ultimately he needed and we need that final " hypothesis " to give meaning not only to the facts discovered by science but to science itself. Further areas of such relative and limited " autonomy " are clearly enough found in the arts, in literature, even (I am inclined to think) in ethics.

Furthermore, as a correlative of this principle of autonomy and the earlier one of incognito, there must emerge freedom of thought and investigation and action in these various realms. But that will involve something else—a tension, a conflict, a contradiction often enough, between the religious and the secular. The two, on our understanding, both proceed from the one God, and therefore cannot be in any ultimate conflict; but because they are on different levels, and operate in different ways, and use different techniques, it is inevitable that they will not always and immediately

appear at one, or even reconcilable. However, when tension occurs, I think, it is not to be regarded with horror, nor is it to be run away from. It is a fact; it may in the end be a richly rewarding, a fruitful fact. That which appears different from our earlier understanding may on further study enrich our thinking; a contradiction need not be resolved quickly (and therefore cheaply)—perhaps if we hang on to both sides, so far as they have anything to be said for them, we shall secure a result which will be unspeakably more valuable. Hence, we are not to impose scientific tests upon religion, nor religious tests upon science, granted the modifications of "mythology," etc., which science may make in primitive religious expression, although not in religious *insight*, and the modifications which ultimate theistic interpretation may make in the crude scientific "mythology" of the laboratory camp-follower. There is no *Christian* science, nor is there Christian art or Christian literature, in the sense that one form or technique is Christian and that alone. There is *true* science, there is *fine* writing, there is *good* art. The ideas expressed in the last two may be Christian, of course; but that is because the experience of the artist or poet is permeated by a Christian conviction, is religious at the centre; it is not because, say, Alexandrines are Christian and the Sapphic form is not.

With all of our insistence on the reality of, and the independent value of, the divine as found incognito within, the secular, we must not overlook the genuine importance of the strictly religious—in the wider and also in the narrower sense of the term. Most certainly there is the religious field, and to it every man whose life is to be rich, who is to be "saved"—that is, to have a healthy, wholesome, abundant development of his true self—must turn. But the principle here is that so nobly described by Baron von Hügel and discussed by Professor Hocking also—the principle of alternation. Not all religion, not all secularity, not all grace, not all nature; but each informing and penetrating the other, the level of nature providing the material upon which grace may do its perfecting work, the level of grace enlightening and enhancing the dignity and significance of the natural. And in the normal life of the normal man the service of God will be sometimes in the forgetfulness of that divine being by the pursuit of the strictly secular, and sometimes in the remembering of Him by the seeking for a conscious fellowship with Him. At school, one was told sometimes to take God

into the "scrum." That was wrong; it was an example of the very confusion against which we have been protesting. Rather, one was to play the game as hard and as clean as one could, forgetting God and all matters religious—so one was serving God under one of His many disguises. It is precisely the same, I think, in the secular studies which engage the attention of philosopher, scientist and artist most of the time.

But I reiterate that the religious, strictly speaking, must have its central though not sole place, and this means the cult-act; it means corporate worship, for the Catholic Christian the mass, as well as the private devotion and personal seeking of God's face. Religion is not merely the "glow" which a certain attitude to life imparts to experience: it is life lived significantly in faith in a God, who for us is believed to have great purposes and to reveal Himself to men in many and most varied ways. And it is life so lived because it is nourished by our entrance into the corporate tradition of the Catholic Church and its liturgical splendour as well as the gentle piety of its saints. So from the daily round of business, the writing of the novel or poem, the investigation of the behaviour of the atom or the movement of the stars, the study of the best that has been thought and said, we turn to our conscious communion with God, seeking Him where by His own will He may be found; and, finding Him, we go out to enrich all of our varied life and experience by His reality and presence, not in the transforming of that variety into a uniformity of "religious experience," but rather in the deepening of the variety and the colouring of life by a newly-found sense of beauty and majesty, purpose and power, because we have brought it all into God's presence, seen and acknowledged it as His, and now are free to enjoy it, suffer it, employ it, as also created and sustained by Him.

Theologically, both the religious and the secular are avenues along which God makes Himself known to men —along the one, more directly and immediately; along the other, less directly and mediately: but along both ultimately and really, for both come from Him who is the author and giver of all good things. And actually it is the Incarnation as fact, and the Incarnation as our final principle of interpretation of God in His relationship to the world and to men, that guarantees these truths, that shows the secular and the religious to be what they are in their own inde-

pendence, and that yet unites them in the greater unity of God's will, purpose, revelation.

If Incarnation were utterly confined to our Lord Jesus Christ, this would not be so; but it is because Incarnation is (in Cardinal Bérulle's noble phrase) "the manner and the mode by which God works in His creatures" that we have this profound conviction. To put it otherwise, since God is self-expressive through His Eternal Word in the mind of Plato, in the inspiration of the musician, in the work of the scientific investigator, and in the labours of the humanist to understand the racial experience, we can believe that that Eternal Word was supremely and effectively made flesh in Christ; and since we believe that He was made flesh in Christ, we must see that He is active in all His works, revealed in every operation of His hands, even though we are not always aware, at the moment and with utter immediacy, that these are indeed the Shekinah of one whose nature and whose name is love.

W. Norman Pittenger.

William Connor Magee

(*Entered into rest May* 5, 1891.)

It is good sometimes to look back upon the great preachers of the past, and see what part they played in their time, and what, if any, message they have for our own day. Much that moved greatly once seems cold and insipid now: the thought is obsolete, the diction unreal, the message unconvincing. Yet the Victorian age was famous for its preachers: Robertson, Kingsley, Liddon, Farrar, Spurgeon, Moody, all were great "pulpit orators," wielding much influence in differing ways, and not the least of them was Magee.

His "life" was written, and ill written, by his lifelong friend, J. C. Macdonnell, in some ways a Lytton Strachey before his time. A man may write to his intimate friends that which should never see the light unbowdlerized, and to perpetuate such a remark as "I am, I fear, a fixture here for life, fishing always in my little glass bowl of an Octagon" (Magee's proprietary chapel in Bath) "for such gold and silver fish as can be coaxed into it," is to do less

than justice to a man who was always a true minister of Christ. The real Magee lives in his imperishable sermons.

The grandson of an Archbishop of Dublin, Magee was educated at T.C.D., held a Dublin curacy, went to Spain to get cured of consumption, and then for ten formative years was minister of the " Octagon," where the curious can still penetrate into the recesses of a furniture shop to see where he held forth. He began as an Evangelical of the variety of Hugh M'Neile, his uncle, but, largely owing to the influence of a Bath clergyman, grew into a sound churchman of what may be termed the " central " school of thought. Four years at Enniskillen and four more as Dean of Cork and of the Chapel Royal at Dublin brought him to the notice of Disraeli, who in the last few days of his premiership appointed him, in 1868, to the see of Peterborough. Here he worked vigorously, feared rather than loved, save by the few, a gallant Church reformer for all his Toryism, a famous wit and raconteur, uttering sometimes wise things untruly and true things unwisely, yet, as his successor's widow says, leaving the diocese in excellent order. There were great men in those days—Tait and Benson at Canterbury, Thomson at York, and with them men such as Wilberforce, Harold Browne, Lightfoot, the two Wordsworths, Selwyn, Temple, Goodwin, Moberly, Ellicott, Fraser, Walsham How, Stubbs and Thirlwall; and if Magee had not the scholarship of some of these he was a wide reader, abreast of the thought of his day, a cogent and lucid reasoner, and at home alike in the House of Lords and on the platform addressing " working men." He was ill-advised to accept translation to York in 1891. Few men of seventy can take up a new task, however well they may continue to administrate their present post, and before he could settle into Bishopthorpe he passed away.

The Times said that his " early sermons were chiefly relished from being interspersed with anecdotes, jests, and ingenious parables, and from being delivered in animated conversational style." This is as untrue of his " Octagon " sermons as of those he preached as a Bishop, greatly as he developed his art. The charism of oratory, called by those who have it not " the gift of the gab," was always his, but what strikes the reader of his sermons to-day is the way in which he put into practice his own homiletical precepts. Lecturing at St Paul's Cathedral in 1875, he divided sermons into two classes, the vertebrate and the invertebrate,

and, altering Demosthenes' saying that the three requisites of an orator were action, action and action, he asserted that they were arrangement, arrangement and arrangement. He certainly clothed his skeleton, but the framework is always perceived. Here, for example, is his famous sermon at the Dublin Church Congress of 1868. Disestablishment was very much in the air, and such widely differing English churchmen as S. Wilberforce and J. C. Ryle had come over, with many others, to stand by their brethren in Ireland. "Well begun is half done," and what better text could have been chosen than "They beckoned to their partners which were in the other ship that they should come and help them"? The title is "The Breaking Net," and mark how the theme is developed. The Church is frequently toiling fruitlessly and then blessed with unexpected success, the latter the more perilous, for if disappointment slackens effort the net remains whole, but if sudden success comes the net's existence is imperilled. And the peril to the filling net is not of the Church's seeking: it is inevitable. (1) But what is the net? Not merely the gospel, not merely the creeds, but all the machinery which the Church devises to draw men heavenward, all that gives the Church a hold in any measure on the age. Our enemies tell us our net is breaking—"free thought, science, criticism, state support and your own parties." Yet these perils come to the net because it is a net, designed to hold unwilling captives. Humanity needs light but loves darkness, needs law and loves lawlessness. Christianity works ever against the grain of human nature. Popularity is no test: what of the Master? "Let us take great heed lest in our fear of the seven times heated furnace of the world's hate and the world's scorn we bow down before its idol, popularity." (2) The very zeal of those who draw it imperils the net. "There is the double strain, that of captor and captive." Revival is here, and there is risk in every revival, whether of doctrine or of practice: but anything is better than that the net should hang idly and rot. (3) Peril comes from the catholicity of the net, good fish and bad. So even the Church has taken into itself "foreign and even hostile elements," Hebrew and Greek converts, heathen schools of philosophy, the Roman state, northern barbarians. Attempts to make the Church less catholic than its Master wished have an air of spirituality: but they come from sloth and fear. "Others may be select because they are not

catholic: she, because she is catholic, must not, dare not, be select." (4) Peril comes through suddenness. "Suddenly the net of some quiet country parish is filled with the influx of a great multitude," and other instances are cited. So the fishermen gather together. Partners are beckoned to. Who? The State? Not now. "The axiom of all modern statesmanship is that nations, as nations, have nothing to do with God. Or other partners, now drifted away? "If for one hour Christendom were one, what could it not achieve!" But union will not come by "agreeing to call diversity agreement and palpable schism unity." So we call on our fellow Anglicans, with whom we are realizing the value of synods, convocations, congresses. This congress at Dublin is a significant fact. You have come from England in our hour of crisis with your sympathy, your counsel, your prayers. England once sought missionaries from Ireland. "Now it is otherwise. Ours is the weakness, yours the strength." Yours is the peril of the breaking net. But either has much to give to the other. "The storm may rage and the black clouds gather and the waves run high, but amidst the roar of the elements we shall still hear Him say, 'It is I, be not afraid'."

Treated thus the sermon is indeed a rattling skeleton, but let it be read as it was preached and the bones have indeed lived, and we can say: "This was a man."

Or, again, in 1880 he takes the Atonement as the subject of a sermon to Oxford University. Men have told the writer how Magee would fold his arms on the pulpit desk and pour forth his closely reasoned message without glancing at a note, and this to a learned and critical audience. The title is "The Ethics of Forgiveness," and the text: "Forgive us our debts."

Incarnation and Atonement go together, but are rejected on different grounds as impossible and immoral. Incarnation is a miracle, and science calls miracles impossible. But atonement involves a low nature of God. "Why cannot you rise to the sublime ideas of the Hebrew prophet and psalmist, who, in their protest against the sanguinary ritual of their day, would take their place beside altars, smoking with the blood of innocent victims, and proclaim a God who could not 'eat the flesh of bulls,' who only bids 'the wicked forsake his way' in order that He may 'abundantly pardon him'?" The moral objection is more serious than the scientific. Some new scientific

discovery might show the possibility of the miraculous, but the decisions of conscience are final, and we must not quibble about God's ways not being our ways: when we are told He loves and forgives we are to understand by these terms what man understands by them.

(1) Sin is a debt, and that debt can be forgiven. How far can *we* forgive our debtors? A man is wronged and forgives, but has the offender forgiven himself? The fuller the forgiveness the greater the remorse. Already we see looming up law, pitiless, unforgiving, inevitable. But what of the onlookers? The more the wronged man forgives, the more we feel bound to avenge him. Self-preservation comes in, too, as a lower motive: "society dare not, cannot forgive its debtors." Law once more comes in. But suppose the offender pays the penalty. Many consequences of his sin abide. So we reach a point where pity, and even justice, vanish, and man is faced with inexorable law.

(2) Apply these analogies to divine pardon. Man can only completely forgive man on one condition, that we can isolate them from all their fellows and regard them as equals. But God can never be in that relation to us: we are not His equals, and He rules "all that complex system of society in which wrong produces endless debt." He is also the author of inexorable laws, which know no forgiveness. "Can we suppose that the great red presses of the vintage of the wrath of God, that are ever crushing out the lees of sin and judgment, will be stayed because some trembling penitent asks that they may be stayed?" In short, "this magniloquent and windy talk about a merciful and compassionate God, so facile and easy in His forgiveness, is a mere conception of modern Theism; that it is, after all, the poorest and lowest idea we can form of God."

(3) Is there any room, then, for divine forgiveness? None, outside miracle. "It needs as much a moral miracle on the part of God to save the sinner from the consequence of his sin, when he transgresses the moral law of the universe, as it would need a physical miracle to snatch him from a storm or an earthquake." Revelation says that Incarnation and Atonement combined make the greatest of all miracles. God has made the world, where men suffer by the operation of its terrible laws, but has also taken into Himself sinful and suffering humanity and made, in the person of His Son, a new and perfect humanity. The "kingdom" is a new world into which we come to seek "deliverance

from the terrible laws of natural justice and punishment, from which otherwise there is no escape." The mediation of Christ is not a different system of forgiveness from that in the parable of the "Prodigal Son," but rather the basis which makes the parable possible and true. The Hebrew prophet proclaiming the worthlessness of sacrifice and the need of a contrite heart might receive a proof of the fact that logically a contrite heart cannot win acceptance with God. But could he have known of the miracle by which alone forgiveness can be won, the revelation of Christ given us in the gospel, would not his difficulties have been removed?

In conclusion, man's conscience, understanding and heart contemplate forgiveness. The first tells of a just penalty for sin; the second that either there is no sin, or else no possible forgiveness of it; the third cries: "God be merciful to me, a sinner." To the first Revelation says "there is a penalty"; to the second, which insists that nothing but a miracle can win forgiveness, it talks of the Incarnation and Atonement; to the heart it replies: "Go to your Father and He will forgive."

This is bare bones, indeed, yet to the writer, wrestling long ago with difficulties over the Atonement and reading book after book to no purpose, it brought the solution of his problems.

As a change from this skeleton-study, it may be useful to look at only a fragment of a fully-clad framework. Here is an extract from the sermon preached to the British Association at Norwich in 1868. "Who, that has ever gone through a regular course of the 'evidences,' does not know the painful effect of such a study upon his own spirit? How, as we begin, for instance, with the historical proof that miracles were wrought and prophecies fulfilled eighteen hundred years ago; and then proceed to the discussion as to what miracles, when themselves proved, can prove; and then plunge into all the historical, critical, physical and metaphysical questions that surround this question of the evidences, and so fight our way slowly, syllogism after syllogism, from proving God to proving Christ, and then to proving Christianity—somehow Christ Himself seems to us very far off, seen through the far distance of eighteen hundred years, hidden by the smoke and dust of centuries of strife. His voice, reaching us faint and far off through the din of battle, seems no longer the voice of our living

Lord. The present Christ, ' our very present help in time of trouble,' the life of all our life, seems to have gone far away. We stand in the presence of the empty tomb from which we have syllogistically demonstrated that He has risen; but somehow we feel like one of old who said, ' They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him ' !"

Not so very long ago Bishop Henson urged us to re-read Robertson of Brighton. It was wise counsel. Others would bid us to look up Maurice again, or Liddon, or Farrar, or Spurgeon. But a man must always swear by the physician who healed him, and naturally believes that one who was a great formative influence upon his own life and thought must still have his message for his fellow-men. Yet he knows that mere second-hand recommendation is not always of much profit. Philip was wise when he did not argue about the unreasonableness of a prejudice against the natives of a certain place, but contented himself with replying: " Come and see "; and the writer would say of *The Gospel and the Age* and the other volumes of Magee what the children playing in a North African garden said to one another: " Take and read."

R. S. T. Haslehurst.

The Church and England

The sanitary arrangements of Minoan Cnossus have an interest of their own, but give little light to the plumber's mate. Historical research in saner days is meant to be of use to men of good will who realize that there is not much juice to be chewed out of the last two hundred years' cud.

God and mammon were white and black. The rich young man could not get his economics right. From the beginning the Fathers were fumbling with money, trying to fit it into the moral scheme. And directly the Church was legalized, the Council of Nicea (325) forbade the clergy to lend money on usury.

In those days there was no Stock Exchange and it was not so hard to see what money was. The Church and the people lived on the land, in reliance on God's providence, and this was more real to them than jimmy o' goblins. Real wealth they saw with their eyes and their hands handled, while

money was a convenience that avoided barter, a claim and a measure that was easy to transfer.

Ambrose insisted that Christianity could not withdraw to the desert (d. 397). The price of a bloke's daily bread was basic in ethics, as "justice, good faith and a fair measure are necessary in all relations." St Wilfrid taught the South Saxons how to fish and then converted them. The Church moved close to reality, not high and dry, and the people believed.

So Gratian shows the canons forbidding usury multiply, while local guilds and Church festivals (not bank-holy days) gave the journeymen a fair reward, and leisure that would make an international labour conference swallow its ink and turn on the machine guns.

St Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) quibbles at Ambrose's definition of what the just price is not—to swerve from the truth, to inflict unjust loss or to use any deceit to raise the price—and undergoes his usual cellular process of splitting in two when faced by a problem, but he gives a useful definition of what it is. "The just price of things is not fixed exactly, but consists rather of an estimate; and such that a slight addition or subtraction does not remove the equality required by justice." The guilds did the fixing.

Aquinas then turns to the just price of money. The use of some articles—houses, land, waggons—is not identical with their consumption, and so a charge for their use may be made. But other articles—food, wine, money—cannot be used without being consumed. So if a charge for the use of money is made, *venditur id quod non est*, you sell what does not exist. A sin against natural reason, a breed of barren metal.

Shortly after Dante joined Usury and Sodomy in one line as a sin against Nature and Art, the Council of Vienne (1311) gave and enforced the final definition of usury, the fruit of 1,000 years' thought.

So the city of God was founded and guarded, but even now the split with reality was germinating. The good canon, Robert Saint Amour, wrote that the lousy friars ought to work, do their own digging: and Saints Aquinas and Bonaventura had him kicked out of Paris.

Until about 800 the Church had obeyed its Founder's command to heal. Unction and the laying on of hands were part of the normal work, the body regarded as the instrument of God or the devil. Gradually the miracle was

replaced by extreme unction and the perverted began to hack at the body.

But no treachery or blindness to the Faith can dim the sun ray of Vienne. Dante had put the usurer in the right place, with the Monster of fraud just round the corner; and Vienne, accepting his position in the moral scale, gave the definition of his crime. It was a sin to demand back more than had been lent *nullo sumptu*, *nullo damno*, *nullo periculo*, and heresy to contradict this. An examination of the three exceptions reveals the beauty and the light of medieval economic science.

Sumptus justified the lender in asking for his expenses, and the transport of metal cost more than book entries: the Augustinians considered 2 per cent. exorbitant.

Damnum, loss that arose, could be reclaimed. *Lucrum cessans*, gain that the lender did not make in the absence of his money, was fishy and banned by St Thomas.

Periculum, risk, is the vital exception. If he shared the profits of a transaction, the lender had to share the risk. This is the distinction between Partnership and Usury. If I invest £100 in a ship's cargo, I am entitled to share the profits; but if the ship sinks, I must share the loss, and to claim the ship as collateral security is usury. I can only be as safe as the Bank of England if I violate the chancy laws of nature.

The Church's insistence that the moral law covered money drove deep into the laws and literature of the people. Boccaccio's Lombard usurers "the Church disdains to receive into her bosom." Chaucer shows that the Rev. Saint Amour was right about the friars, and hammers at Richard II's injustices, warning. Usury in Chaucer is mortal sin.

Creed made a notable difference in the attitude to money:

> Ther was in Asie, in a greet citee,
> Amonges cristen folk, a Iewerye,
> Susteyned by a lord of that contree
> For foule usure and lucre of vilanye,
> Hateful to Christ and to his companye.

Now "it doesn't matter what you believe"!

The Jews' double morality allowed them to lend on usury to a stranger, but Edward I held that it was the Crown's prerogative to issue money, and expelled usurious loan finance from England. Edward III passed a law Against

Usury in 1341. The King and his deputies were " to have cognizance of the usurers dead," and the ordinances of the Holy Church to " have cognizance of usurers on life, as to them appertaineth, to make compulsion by the censures of the Holy Church for the sin, to make restitution of the usuries taken against the law of the Holy Church."

The Church found out what the moral law was, whole and in order, and the state enforced it. England, green and merry, served in perfect freedom from the usurer's chain. And Burgundy's lament in Henry V (" But hateful docks, rough thistles, kecksies, burs," etc.) describes the effect of war on the land and not of our late lamented peace.

There was trouble about the two swords and a Babylonish captivity, but the people still loved their Church and looked to her for protection. Henry VII further tightened the law against usury in two acts, the latter covering " dampnable bargaynes groundyt in usurie."

During these great days the Church farmed her own land and issued her own money. Instead of an international, impersonal, unreal system of finance, local mints, regal and ecclesiastic, issued currency where needed. Most cathedral towns have their Silver Street. The Church issued money for eight hundred years before the Reformation, notably in York, Canterbury and Durham, and so had experience in finance as well as agriculture, the two bases of civilization that have been so neglected.

William Franklyn wrote to Wolsey: " At last being in London, I spoke to a friend to provide me silver for coining at Durham, and on Good Friday received a lire from him whereby I percieve that I shall have of him every year 1200 l. of silver which will be very profitable to your grace and to all the countrie. . . ." The profit to the mint master was 11d. in 450d., to the ecclesiastic 1d. from each 1 lb. of silver. We may compare this with the salaries of bank directors and the wage of bank clerks, and wonder what has happened to the profit to all the country.

Occasionally the Bishops were asked *quo warranto* they had dies, and always replied that they had been in siesin of having dies from time immemorial. The general policy was to issue money from local mints where needed. Currency was scarce in Chichester, so King John commanded that two dies for the King and one for the Bishop should be used there. These decentralized mints served the people once and might serve them again. Old churches distinguish

the English from the American countryside, and perhaps the castles should crumble no further. But the new barons, like the old, would be paid for service and protection; living on mine royalties in the dukeries is hardly a title to a mint !

More Americano, Henry VIII disliked the power of the Church and wanted to own the whole of England. Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, was despoiled of his mint in 1536, and about the same time the Archbishops of York and Canterbury lost the privilege which they had held " from time immemorial." This was a stride towards centralized finance, and for the Church was not so much a loss of profit but of direct experience in money. The Church land was seized at the Dissolution, so that our religion was no longer rooted in the soil, bound up with reality and God.

In 1545 usury was legalized up to 10 per cent. But the Act was called " Against Usury " and gave no moral sanction to the violation of nature.

More still was to go. The 1549 Prayer Book had a trace of the old healing beliefs in the permission to administer unction to the sick and in the prayer for bodily health, but the Prayer Book of 1552 cut this out and regarded bodily sickness as a visitation, not of the devil, but of a Puritan providence.

However, the Church was still faithful and strong enough to have a law passed in 1552 banning all usury. John Blaxton published in 1634 an anthology of condemnations of usury by various divines. It was an unfashionable book for Blaxton's time, but he was Preacher of God's Word at Osmington, in Dorsetshire, a bit behind the City. Archbishop Sandys opens the anthology with four sermons condemning usury, saying it is a " biting worm " and that " this cancer hath corrupted all England." Bishop Jewell says, " It is filthy gains and a work of darkness, it is a monster of nature, the overthrow of mighty kingdoms, the plague of the world and the misery of the people: it is theft, it is the murdering of our brethren. . . ." None of this is rhetoric. " It consumeth up rich men, it eateth up the poor, it maketh many bankrupts and undoeth many householders." And he uses the good old threat of excommunication.

Bishop King, of London (!), points out that in Roman law the thief was bound to make restitution of double, the usurer of fourfold, as " they esteemed usury to be a double

theft, and that at least is my judgment." Bishop Lake, of Bath and Wells, said in the pulpit: " The divell is the plain image of usurers, who live by the sweat of other men's brows and cunningly grow rich by undoing others by a seeming relief." Downham, Bishop of Derry, was proudly called the hammer of the usurers. Babington of Worcester says: " Surely these are cursed flies indeed, the suckers of our sap, the bibbers of our blood, the pinchers of our hearts, the stringers and wringers of our very souls." I wonder if he had taxes, war, poverty, insanity and suicide in mind?

The question of burning heretics now arises. Calvin (d. 1564) was asked by a merchant whether usury was intrinsically evil, and he replied that it was not (Ep. 383). He put his own judgment against twelve hundred years of the Church's thought and gave usury an authority. All the other reformers of the time—Luther, Zwingli and the rest —maintained the Catholic ban on usury, but Calvin's word was enough for the divorce between business and morality.

Elizabeth made a compromise. Another law Against Usury was passed in 1571 which allowed usury up to 10 per cent., but gave it no backing as " all usury, being forbidden by the law of God, is sin detestable."

In these years Finance was making its big push. Every parson in the diocese of Canterbury was told to read Bullinger's defence of usury in 1586, but Tawney describes how the decent clergy showed fight. Thomas Wilson, Rogers, etc., " fulminated against usury." Besides, Shakespeare is with us. Throughout the epics, tragedies and comedies usury is always evil, and one play (1594) is a contest between the two moralities:

> I hate him for he is a Christian;
> But more for that in low simplicity
> He lends out money gratis and brings down
> The rate of usance here with us in Venice.

And Shakespeare (in 1606) maintains the scale of values detailed in Dante:

> This avarice
> Sticks deeper, grows with more pernicious root
> Than summer-seeming lust.

In 1610 the choice for the Primacy was between Lancelot Andrewes and Abbot. Abbot was a bigoted Calvinist, Andrewes saw the faith whole. He not only condemned

usury and insisted on the just price in *The Moral Law Expounded* and *A Pattern of Christian Doctrine*, but wrote a Latin treatise called *Legalized Usury is Unlawful*. "Calvin says that usury may be taken from a rich man 'for he can lose it without harm.' Gentlemen, is not this a plea for burglars?" Everyone, he says, should have found by experience that Divine Providence is indispensable, but the usurer's concern is to remove himself and his possessions altogether from the hands of God. He quotes: "What is usury? Legalized robbery. What is a usurer? A thief who announces his intention beforehand." "Loan charges amount to hundreds of thousands a year, taxes have to be doubled." There is no better argument from expediency for usury than for brothels.

Andrewes also defended tithes because priest and people share the vagaries of nature. But tithes then were in goods, not money. He also protested against the enclosure of common pasture. The Church wanted Andrewes, but somebody or something said no.

In 1624 usury was legalized up to 8 per cent. in an Act Against Usury, "provided no word herein contayned shall be construed or expounded to allow the practise of usury in point of Religion or Conscience." Usury was still a sin. Landor suggests that Calvin was attempting to re-introduce the religion of the Jews, but the new chosen race of financiers recognized no prohibition to prey on their own race.

A Nottingham paper suggested that bankers might well have celebrated a tercentenary last year, "for the rise of banking in England had often been dated from the seizure by Charles I, in 1640, of the bullion deposited in the Tower of London by the City merchants.

"It was, in fact, returned to its rightful owners, but for safety thereafter they deposited the bullion with the goldsmiths, whose 'side-line' as money changers developed greatly during the Civil War. For money lodged with them they gave receipts, which were the earliest form of bank notes in England, and circulated freely as coin." The next step was for the receipts or bank notes to exceed the deposits.

After Charles I was martyred the Roundheads got their own way. In 1660 an Act was passed limiting usury to 6 per cent., but it was called "For the restraining of taking of excessive Usury," not "Against Usury" as had been

all previous Acts. The Law of God was not mentioned. And in 1670 Richard Baxter's *Christian Directory* announced that the Law of Nature does not forbid all usury, only the kind that violates justice or charity.

And so the whole traditional doctrine of the just price was shuffled away, and the distinctions between partnership and usury blurred. " Who has ever heard a sermon holding forth usury as a sin ?" asked James Harvey in *Paper Money*, 1877. The last was apparently preached by David Jones in 1692 at St Mary Woolnoth. He considered it " the preacher's duty to protest against usury," but seems to have lost his parish for the outrage. His brave voice was stifled by " A Discourse on Usury published at the request of several judicious and sober Christians." This admitted that " the subject of late years has not been much controverted," and that " the dealings of usury are become universal."

Five churches around 1680 were dedicated to Charles the Martyr, showing a revulsion against Cromwell. But the Bank of England was founded in 1694.

Bishop Berkeley in 1735 saw through to the roots. In his *Querist* he asked:

> *Qu.* 35. " Whether money be not in truth tickets or tokens . . . and whether it be of much consequence what materials the tickets are made of ?
>
> 446. " Whether we are not, in fact, the only people who may be said to starve in the midst of plenty ?
>
> 459. " Whether a national bank be not the true philosopher's stone in a state ? Whether it be not a mighty privilege for a private person to be able to create an hundred pounds with the dash of his pen ?"

Smollet and Fielding distinguished between the sin of the usurer and of the incontinent in the Dantesque tradition. But the Church and England were losing touch. Between 1757 and 1830 there were commutation clauses in 2,000 local Acts, changing the payment required of the farmer from kind to money. A farmer grows corn, but he cannot grow money. In 1778 a rector was paid 3d. per acre if the land was in pasture, 5d. if ploughed. But the Tithe Commutation Acts of 1836-1860 completed the change.

Over the same period Crabbe and Trollope gave warning that unless the farm labourer was paid, he would move to the city. Towards the end of the eighteenth century dis-

content with the financial system is manifested in broadsheets. The income tax was just being introduced to pay the interest on the National Debt. One called Tax and Axe shows awareness:

I boldly declare
Whoever they are
That pretend for to govern a realm,
If they suffer the State
To be drowned in Debt
They deserve to be kicked from the helm.

O that a good nob
Had hold of the job,
Cheap plenty would have a free scope;
Each national bite
He'd soon put to right
With a little good sense and a rope.

But the economic science of the Church was no longer used to guide the nobs or to protect the dignity of the vast masses of labour potential. Man was considered the slave of economic laws which no effort of will or God could circumvent. Usury laws were finally abolished in 1854.

In *The Way We Live Now* Trollope shows an international financier elected to Parliament for Westminster and entertaining the Emperor of China. A Jew is accepted into a country family to buy it out and a suspect American lady also has a hand in the invasion. Faith in God had practically gone. And the distinction between issuing money, as the Bishops had done, and lending it, as the Rothschilds were doing, was too sharp for minds that were speculating in slums.

Charles Kingsley took some interest in money, and since his time the Church has been moving back to the Catholic position. Leo XIII reasserted the doctrine of the Just Price in *Rerum Novarum*, and Pius XI went on to expose the money system in *Quadragesimo Anno*. Current thought has not advanced from Leo to Pius.

In 1935 the Church Assembly distinguished between Work (the exercise of man's creative instincts) and Employment (wage slavery). And a realization is coming that we are very far gone from the land. More of tradition is being recovered in the renewal of Spiritual Healing.

So far the only rival to the medieval beauty of architecture is Lord Vestey's tower! To the centralized masses the

Church still probably appears as a diluted rum ration or a respectable veneer.

But contact is being re-established, for the Church alone contains the necessities of Salvation among her treasures new and old.

HENRY SWABEY.

APROPOS OF "THE ECLIPSE OF THE HIGHBROW"

"The most thankless life of all is to be an author who writes for authors. One can divide authors into two classes, those who write for readers, and the real authors, those who write for authors. These latter are unintelligible to the reading public, are looked upon as mad and are almost despised—and in the meanwhile authors of the second class plunder their works and have a tremendous success with what they have stolen and spoilt. And thus the authors of the second class become the worst enemies of the others—it is a matter of some importance to them that no one should discover the real position."—KIERKEGAARD, *Journals*, p. 199.

"To our dreadful education close thinking is but obscurity, and the easy is taken for both the clear and the free."—P. T. FORSYTH, *The Church and the Sacraments*, p. 287.

"Only a handful of people in any age are its true contemporaries."—LEWIS MUMFORD, *The Culture of Cities*, p. 74.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Very Rev. Dr Micklem is Provost of Derby; he was formerly Rector of St James's Church, Sydney.

The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger is Fellow and Tutor of the General Theological Seminary, New York.

The Rev. R. S. T. Haslehurst, B.D., is Priest Vicar and Vice-Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral.

The Rev. Henry Swabey is Assistant Curate of St John's Church, Long Eaton, Nottingham.

The Rev. Dr Grensted is Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford.

The Rev. John Boys is a missionary priest in the diocese of Lebombo.

Mother Mary Maude is Superior-General of the Community of St Mary (U.S.A.).

REVISED REVIEWS—IV

The Varieties of Religious Experience. By William James.

It is exactly forty years since William James gave the first course of his Gifford Lectures, and the book, one of the most popular and one of the most remarkable volumes in that famous series, appeared in 1902. Its influence was immediate and lasting. It opened the eyes of a multitude of rather startled readers to a new and apparently a scientific way of interpreting religious experience, and its sheer brilliance of style, in which it remains unsurpassed among the literature of its subject, has always made it carry conviction to the reader, even when he does not quite know of what he is being convinced.

For what a delightful book it is to read!—just as good now as it ever was. There are the twelve lines of satire in which he disposes of medical materialism: "Carlyle's organ-tones of misery it accounts for by a duodenal catarrh." There is the picture of Henry Alline, with the final grim note from his diary: "On Wednesday the 12th I preached at a wedding, and had the happiness thereby to be the means of excluding carnal mirth." There is Margaret Fuller's "I accept the universe," and Carlyle's "Gad, she'd better." Epigram after epigram: "the world is all the richer for having a devil in it, so long as we keep our foot upon his neck"; "a Catherine of Siena, panting to stop the warfare among Christians which was a scandal of her epoch, can think of a no better method of union among them than a crusade to massacre the Turks"; "compared with these beaked and taloned graspers of the world, saints are herbivorous animals,

tame and harmless barnyard poultry"; "if transcendental philosophy were as objectively and absolutely rational as it pretends to be, could it possibly fail so egregiously to be persuasive?"

In its brilliance, its readability, and above all in its broad humanity, time has done nothing to wither James' work. The insight with which he reads human nature is as incisively true now as it was forty years ago. Some passages, indeed, are more up-to-date than when they were written. "The Saint is, therefore, abstractly a higher type of man than the 'strong man,' because he is adapted to the highest society conceivable, whether that society ever be concretely possible or not. The strong man would immediately tend by his presence to make that society deteriorate. It would become inferior in everything save in a certain kind of bellicose excitement, dear to men as they now are." "What we have now to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war: something heroic that will speak to men as universally as war does, and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved itself to be incompatible. I have often thought that in the old monkish poverty-worship, in spite of the pedantry which infested it, there might be something like that moral equivalent of war which we are seeking. May not voluntarily accepted poverty be 'the strenuous life,' without the need of crushing weaker peoples?"

But when we come to a more careful reading of the book, whether we regard it as an essay in psychology or as a descriptive study of religious behaviour, its limitations become very obvious. It is, as James himself said, only a pioneer study, written at a date when the psychological developments which are to-day most significant were only in their infancy. Freud had only just published his *Traumdeutung*. The independent work of Jung and Adler had not begun. Behaviourism was only a cloud on the horizon, though a cloud to some extent conjured into existence by James himself when he asked, half seriously, whether consciousness exists at all. The immense recent development of the *Gestalt* psychology, with its enormous influence upon experimental work, was not even near its dawn. It is true that James himself, with his wide interests and his fertile imagination, stands at the parting of the ways, and that his writings served more perhaps than any others to set these new movements free. But his work has the defects as well as the freshness of youth, and he remained incorrigibly young to the last. When *The Varieties of Religious Experience* is compared with such a book as J. B. Pratt's *The Religious Consciousness*, we feel as though we are judging the adventurous essay of a brilliant and rather naughty freshman by the standard of the mature and comprehensive and far duller wisdom of his tutor. All the business about the sick soul and its conflicts, about the subliminal self and the "threshold of consciousness," and the subconscious

development of conflict with its issue in conversion and saintliness, is little more than descriptive, as compared with the detailed studies that are now possible. And it depends far too much upon the selection of the kinds of case that make a good story. Quite unintentionally James leaves the impression that to have any religious experience at all is to enter the region of the bizarre. The very ordinary religious life of ordinary people hardly comes in at all. It is here that later writers, such as Pratt and Thouless, have done much to correct the emphasis.

Even more serious than this selection of material is the very restricted and individualistic conception of religion. James is aware that there is such a thing as institutional religion, but he does not like it, and he firmly rules " theology and ecclesiasticism " out of his discussion. His definition of religion places him, surprisingly, at the side of Plotinus and Whitehead. It is to mean " the feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine." It is " enthusiasm in solemn emotion," and the only available criteria are " immediate luminousness, philosophical reasonableness, and moral helpfulness." But this is to limit the whole discussion to a very small cross-section of all that religion has meant in the lives of men, and when the selection of material is itself so one-sided the limitation amounts to a real distortion of the evidence.

It is not perhaps of much importance to note how far James' closing chapters depend upon his own peculiar philosophical speculations. His Pluralism and Pragmatism are entirely characteristic, but they are now entirely out of date. What is more interesting is to note the hints of future developments of thought, hints which mark the true pioneer and which are a real criterion of the importance of his work. For the *Varieties*, with all its defects, is undoubtedly a great book. And so his discussion of the sick soul, with its suggestion that those who pass by this way may see further into the real world than all the apostles of healthy-mindedness, is prophetic of many of the findings of modern analytical therapy. His emphasis upon the emotions, as opposed to rational states, is one of his own peculiar contributions, but it is endorsed by much that has been written since his time. And his suggestion of an ultra-marginal region of the subconscious self which is the special sphere of our contact with God has a hint of Jung's theory of the collective unconscious, with its dominants, in which the development of religion in the ego is conceived as taking place. Here and in much else James looks forward, and we, who now know what was coming, may well be surprised at his prescience. Very few scientific books are worth reading, except by historians, after forty years. This is one of the exceptions. It is a book that has deserved its fame.

L. W. Grensted.

"G.O.E."—A RETROSPECT AND A SUGGESTION

THE Note in the August (1940) issue of THEOLOGY, in which the Editor reiterates his intention of not relaxing his concern with the whole range of Christian evangelism, is to be welcomed. Perhaps those of us who are working far from the conflict see even more clearly than those at home the danger of allowing present pre-occupations (however essential and praiseworthy) entirely to overshadow the pressing duty of "thinking ahead" for the difficult days which are sure to follow the war. I am therefore encouraged to put on paper some thoughts which have been developing in my mind ever since my ordination in 1935, and even before, in the hope that they may awaken an echo in the minds of others.

After the war we shall probably see a shortage of clergy in the Anglican Communion, though perhaps not so acute as in 1918. The number of men ordained each year during the war will diminish, and few, if any, of our younger men are likely to begin their training during hostilities. The time, therefore, seems opportune for some hard thinking about clergy training.

Undoubtedly the best training is an Honours course in theology at a university, followed by a period of residence at a theological college, during which the ordinand may synthesize the factual knowledge gained during his theological course, learn the professional duties of a priest, and have some time for developing his devotional life. Unfortunately most men cannot have this full opportunity, and many of them will have to be content with something less. In short, I am thinking of the "G.O.E." or "L.Th." man, who spends three years at a theological college, and then may, or may not, take a short Pass Degree course at Durham University. A study of the Ordination Lists during the past few years will show that such men form a considerable percentage of ordinands.

During my course of study for L.Th. I was always conscious of intellectual confusion. Part of it was probably owing to the possession of faulty or limited intellectual equipment; but so many other men have told me that they have experienced the same feeling that I cannot help thinking that part of the trouble lay outside ourselves. An analysis of this feeling of confusion in my own mind has led me to the belief that it was largely due to the arrangement of the syllabus. Before expanding this statement, may I submit the following table for reference?

FIRST PERIOD OF STUDY (G.O.E. PART I OR L.TH. PART A).

Subject of Study.	*Approximate Period of History.*
Old Testament (1)	Creation to 550 B.C.
New Testament (1)	A.D. 1 to A.D. 33
Systematic Theology (1)	Indefinite
Church History	A.D. 100 to A.D. 1054
Christian Morals	Indefinite

Second Period of Study (G.O.E. Part II or L.Th. Part B).

Subject of Study.	*Approximate Period of History.*
Old Testament (2)	B.C. 550 to A.D. 70
New Testament (2)	A.D. 33 to A.D. 100
Systematic Theology (2)	Indefinite
Church History (2)	A.D. 1054 to present day
Christian Worship	Indefinite

An analysis of the above table reveals some interesting facts. It will be seen that the student studies the Life of Christ in the first year of his course, but knows nothing of the Jewish history immediately preceding the Christian era until the second half of the course. He begins studying " Church History " in the first half of his course, but gets no link between the Life of our Lord and A.D. 100 until he studies " The Apostolic Age " in the second half of the course. He studies the Doctrines of Man and Sin during the first half of the course, but knows nothing of the Reformation background until he comes to Church History (2) in the second half of the course.

These historical gymnastics are confusing enough, but they are not the worst part of the story; still more serious is the amount of overlapping between the different subjects. For instance, the lecturer in " Old Testament " is expected to deal with " History, Morals and Worship " in the Pre-Exilic and Post-Exilic periods respectively. But the lecturers in " Systematic Theology," " Christian Morals " and " Christian Worship " will all be dealing, to some extent, with Old Testament antecedents, and their treatment of this subject will take no account of whether the student has already studied " Old Testament Part 2 " or not. The lecturer in " Systematic Theology Part 1 " is expected to deal with " the Scriptural Basis " of certain basic doctrines of the Christian Faith, but at this period of his course the student will have learnt nothing of post-Exilic Judaism, nothing of the Apostolic Age, and nothing of Church History after A.D. 1054.

Further examples of overlapping might be given in all subjects, but enough has been said to illustrate the argument.

So far my criticism has been destructive, and it is with the greatest diffidence that I venture to suggest the outlines of a reform. In the first place, I am not suggesting that the " G.O.E." is the sole end of a theological college training; I am not even suggesting that the examination method is the best way of training clergy. I agree, however, with the member of the staff of a theological college who said: " Whether we like it or not, the examination system seems to be the only practical way, and we have to make the best of it." What I am concerned about is that we should really make the best of it, and not a " half-best."

I take it that the principle on which the G.O.E. and L.Th. syllabus was drawn up was that it is necessary to give non-

graduates a " bird's-eye " view of the main field of theological knowledge, without encouraging specialization on any one aspect, for which in any case there is no time in a three or four years' course. The ground was therefore mapped out into various fields of knowledge—Old Testament, New Testament, History, Systematic Theology, Morals, Worship—and, for the convenience of students, the whole course was divided into two parts, with an examination at the end of each part.

Now, each of these subjects is one aspect of God's dealings with man and man's response; the link between them is the fact that they are different aspects of the one drama which has been, and is being, played against the background of history.

I would therefore submit the following table as the basis of what I feel to be a more satisfactory and less confusing syllabus for such men:

First Period of Study: Historical Background.—The Ancient World, Old Testament History, New Testament History, Church History.

Second Period of Study : Development of Theology in the Ancient World, Judaism, Our Lord's Teaching, the Apostolic Age, the Councils, the Reformation, and later.

Third Period of Study: Development of Christian Morals, dealt with in the same historical sequence.

Fourth Period of Study: Development of Christian Worship from Jewish antecedents to present day.

This table does not pretend to be more than a mere outline, but it illustrates sufficiently clearly the reform which I have in mind. The student would first study the historical background; he would become acquainted with some of the landmarks and with the chief characters in the drama. Then, always against this background, he would study the development of Belief, Morals, and Worship.

In this way he will be led to see the place of the Christian revelation in the world process; he will see more clearly the relevance of " Old Testament " to " New Testament," and the relevance of both to " Church History." He will perhaps understand a little more clearly what St Paul meant when he described the Church as " the true Israel "; he will be saved from the ever-present danger of feeling that he has " done " one subject, and can safely forget it before he passes on to another.

There are some practical difficulties, of course. One is the question of time. The best way of introducing the suggested syllabus would be by extending the course to four years; if this were found to be impracticable, then each period would have to be reduced to, say, two terms. (It will be noted that I have not attempted to extend the scope of study, only to rearrange it.)

Another difficulty would be the question of staff for lectures, but this surely is not insuperable. To take an example:

Lecturer.	*Present System.*	*Suggested System.*
Mr A. ..	Old Testament	Background to A.D. 1
Mr B. ..	New Testament	Background A.D. 1 to A.D. 100
Mr C. ..	Church History	Background A.D. 100 to A.D. 1940
Mr D. ..	Christian Worship	Christian Worship
Mr E. ..	Christian Morals	Christian Morals
Mr F. ..	Systematic Theology	Systematic Theology

This does not seem to me to entail any great hardship on any one lecturer; the effect would be that each lecturer would, at any one time, be responsible for a small group of students who had reached the stage of study for which he is responsible, rather than having to give lectures to students who have arrived at different stages.

There might have to be some rearrangement of examinations, and I would suggest:

Examination 1: At the end of the second period of study (Historical Background, Development of Theology).

Examination 2: At the end of the fourth period of study (Development of Christian Morals and Worship).

The test of a student's ability to synthesize his knowledge might well be left to the Bishop's Examiners, with the result that the Deacons' Examination might become less of a formality than it is at present.

So long as we have the G.O.E. with us (and I for one can see no alternative at present) we must make the best of it, and I feel that some rearrangement of the syllabus on the lines suggested would go far towards helping theological college staffs to approximate to the ideals laid down by Dr Prideaux in his article in the October, 1938, issue of THEOLOGY.

JOHN BOYS.

A KIERKEGAARD BIBLIOGRAPHY

[The author of the correction printed on p. 320 of the November (1940) THEOLOGY concerning the publisher of *Purify Your Hearts*, by Kierkegaard, is apparently unaware that another translation of the same work was issued by Harper Bros in 1938 under the title of *Purity of Heart*, the translator being Donald V. Steere, of Haverford College, U.S.A. He also states that this was the first of Kierkegaard's works to appear in the English language; but Walter Lowrie in his Preface to *Stages in Life's Way* (Princeton University Press, 1940) says: "To Professor Hollander will always belong the distinction of being the first to translate into English any part of S. K.'s works." The translation referred to is entitled *Selections from the Writings of Kierkegaard*, by L. M. Hollander (University

of Texas Bulletin No. 2326, 1932). The demand for it has exhausted the edition, and a second-hand copy can with difficulty be procured. Another earlier publication was *Philosophical Fragments*, translated by David F. Swenson of the University of Minnesota and published by the Princeton University Press in 1936.]

A. Translations of the Works of S. Kierkegaard

Selections from the Writings of Kierkegaard. By L. M. Hollander. University of Texas Bulletin 2326. 1932. Pp. 239. (Out of print.)

Diary of a Seducer. By S. A. Kierkegaard. Translated by Kund Fick. Dragon Press, Ithaca, N.Y. 1932. Pp. 173.

Philosophical Fragments or a Fragment of Philosophy. By Johannes Climacus. Responsible for publication, S. Kierkegaard. Translated from the Danish, with Introduction and Notes, by David Swenson, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Minnesota. Princeton University Press. 1936. Pp. xxx+105.

Purify Your Hearts. By S. A. Kierkegaard. Translated by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Ferrie. London: C. W. Daniel Company, Ltd. 1937. Pp. 179.

Purity of Heart is to Will one Thing. Spiritual Preparation for the Feast of Confession. By Søren Kierkegaard. Translated from the Danish, with an Introductory Essay, by Douglas V. Steere, Associate Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College. Harper and Bros. 1938. Pp. xxviii+207.

This and the preceding are translations of the same work.

The Journals of Søren Kierkegaard. A selection edited and translated by Alexander Dru. Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. lxi+603.

Fear and Trembling. A Dialectical Lyric by Johannes de Silentio. Translated from the Danish by Robert Payne. Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xv+192.

The Point of View, etc., including The Point of View for my work as an Author, Two notes about "The Individual," and On my work as an Author. By Kierkegaard. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Walter Lowrie. Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xvi+174.

Christian Discourses and The Lilies of the Field and The Birds of the Air and Three Discourses at the Communion on Fridays. By Søren Kierkegaard. Translated, with an Introduction, by Walter Lowrie, D.D. Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xviii+389.

The Present Age and Two Minor Ethico-religious Treatises. By Kierkegaard. Translated by Alexander Dru and Walter Lowrie. Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. xii+163.

The two minor treatises are entitled: Has a Man the Right to let Himself be put to Death for the Truth ? and Of the Difference between a Genius and an Apostle.

Stages on Life's Way. By S. Kierkegaard. Translated by Walter Lowrie, D.D. Princeton University Press. 1940. Pp. vi+472.

Consider the Lilies, being the second part of Edifying Discourses in a Different Vein. By S. Kierkegaard. Translated by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Fernie. London: C. W. Daniel Company, Ltd. 1941.

For Self Examination. Oxford University Press. 1941. Pp. 256.

Training in Christianity. Oxford University Press. 1941. Pp. 304.

The following titles are shortly to be published :

Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments. Translated and edited by David F. Swenson and Walter Lowrie. Princeton University Press.

Stages on Life's Road. Oxford University Press.

Unscientific Postscript. Oxford University Press.

B. Books Concerning the Life and Work of S. Kierkegaard

Kierkegaard : His Life and Thought. By E. L. Allen, Ph.D. Stanley Nott, Ltd., London. 1935. Pp. x+210.

Søren Kierkegaard : His Life and Religious Teaching. By John A. Bain, M.A., D.D. Student Christian Movement Press. 1935. Pp. 160.

Søren Kierkegaard. By Theodor Haecker. Translated, with a biographical note, by Alexander Dru. Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. 67.

The best brief introduction to Kierkegaard.

Kierkegaard. By Walter Lowrie, D.D. Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. xviii+636.

Indispensable for students of the life and work of Kierkegaard. An appendix contains a synopsis of all his writings chronologically arranged.

Lectures on the Religious Thought of Soren Kierkegaard. By Edward Geismar, Professor of Theology at the University of Copenhagen. With an Introduction by David F. Swenson, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Minnesota. The Stone Foundation Lectures given at Princeton Theological Seminary in March, 1936. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis. 1938. Pp. vii+97.

An extensive review valuable as an introduction to the work of Kierkegaard was published in *The Times Literary Supplement*

for March 27, 1937. The author was evidently acquainted with Kierkegaard's works in the original Danish. The books reviewed were Swenson's translation of Philosophical Fragments; Haecker's monograph on Kierkegaard; a French translation from the Russian, entitled *Kierkegaard et la philosophie existentielle* (Paris: Vrin); and *Kierkegaard* (Da Franco Lombardi. Florence: La Nuova Italia). He also mentioned *Etudes kierkegardiennes*, by J. Wahl, which was shortly after published by Aubier, Paris.

Other reviews worth looking up appeared in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* for July 1, August 19, and September 2, 1938, under the signatures of Canon Peter Green and Artifex.

MOTHER MARY MAUDE, C.S.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN UNWORTHY FORM OF SERVICE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I feel that some protest must be made against the Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God which was issued by authority for use on March 23, 1941. Whether or not it is desirable to set aside Sundays in Lent as days of national and patriotic prayer is very doubtful; but if such a course is to be pursued, then the Church has at least the right to demand that the forms of service provided should be worthy of the occasion. The present form is utterly unworthy, and at one point becomes profane almost to the point of blasphemy when it takes a sentence out of the great High Priestly prayer of Christ and applies it to our hopes of winning the war.

The Archbishop of York has recently reminded us that " the spirit in which we fight matters more than our winning," but the compiler of this service takes quite a different point of view. To his mind military victory is obviously the thing that matters most, for the whole service is concerned not with lifting us up to God, but with dragging Him down to fight with us against the Central Powers. The tone of the service is not " Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me," but " Through God will we do great acts, for it is He that shall tread down our enemies " (p. 7).

Surely the object of a Day of Prayer, in a time of strain such as this, should be to strengthen people's faith and deepen their charity. Many people are finding their faith severely tried, but the only help which this Form of Service offers to them is to make them feel that if they pray hard enough God will see them through to victory. Again, the war is placing upon people's charity a strain which at times is almost unendurable; yet the

service is silent on the subject of charity—perhaps because too much charity might weaken the national effort. At the very moment when the angry temper of the community is steadily rising under the strain of sleepless nights and the fear of mutilation or death the writer of this service invites us to pray that God will destroy the enemy and break their teeth (*cf.* Psalms iii and v, chosen for use at Mattins). Is this the highest service which the Church can render to the nation at a time of spiritual crisis? "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

The real tragedy about this service is that it has deteriorated so lamentably from the standard set ten months ago. The service which was issued for use on May 26, 1940, was, on the whole, a reasonable form of service for such an occasion. Since then the whole spirit of the country, as expressed by the press, by the wireless, and by the conversation of the "man in the street," has noticeably changed for the worse. Such a change was to be expected. The strain and anxiety of total war are bound to have that sort of effect on a population so little trained in Christian ways of thought as we are. The overwhelming tragedy is that the Church itself should have succumbed to this evil influence.

In the 1940 service the keynote was trust in God, with a prayer that we might be worthy of the task which we had undertaken: the burden of the present service is a passionate prayer that God will give us victory over our enemies. In 1940, when we prayed for the forces, we prayed that "whether by life or by death they might win for the whole world the fruits of their sacrifice and a holy peace": in 1941 we pray that they may "wrest victory out of danger" (p. 6). In 1940, when we prayed for victory, we prayed that God would "judge between us and our enemies, and that if it were His will He would grant victory to our arms": in 1941 we pray that God will "assist our battle" (p. 6). In 1940 Psalms were chosen to convey the idea of courage and of the peace and power which come from living close to God (xx, xxvii, xlvi and cxxi); in 1941 we are invited to sing Psalms of imprecation and revenge (iii and v).

It is this that is so tragic. I say nothing of the fact that the service ends with two sentences which are not even grammatical; I will not complain of the poverty of expression in such a prayer as that which is to be introduced into the liturgy before the blessing; I can forgive the bewildering way in which the leaflet is arranged and the vulgarity of some of its wording; but what I cannot forgive is the fact that the Church has allowed itself to be infected by the evil and damnable spirit which, like a cancer, is eating into people's minds all around us. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* There is the tragedy—greater than the destruction of our homes, greater than the destruction of our churches, greater even than would be the defeat of what we are fighting

for. "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost his savour, it is good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under the foot of men."

Mr Middleton Murry has written of the "betrayal" of Christ by the Churches. It is a hard word and one which, when I first read his book, I thought unjust. The publication of this Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving has made me revise that judgment. For it is a betrayal—a betrayal of Christ and a betrayal of those who are striving, against almost overwhelming odds, to keep the flame of sanity and of charity alive in the hearts of men.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN R. H. MOORMAN.

FALLOWFIELD,
March 26, 1941.

NOTES

In connexion with Bro. George Every's book, *Christian Discrimination* (Sheldon Press, 1s. 6d.), a list of questions has been prepared entitled "An Examination in Christian Discrimination." This will be found very useful by discussion groups who are engaged in studying the book. It can be obtained from the S.C.M., Moel Llys, Kirby Muxloe, Leicester, price 1d. per copy.

The S.C.M. Press has published *A Christian Year-Book*—"a popular reference book of places, people and events, societies and churches, including those concerned with the ecumenical movement," price 2s. 6d. It fills a gap and may well become a hardy annual—an ecclesiastical "Whitaker's Almanack." In that case it will benefit from criticism. The statistics on p. 263 concerning the numbers of Anglican communicants, clergy, Sunday-school scholars and Bible-class members are carelessly and misleadingly compiled. We fail to appreciate the distinction between "the Church *in* Wales" and "the Church *of* Ireland" (pp. 197, 258).

BOOK REVIEWS

Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine. By Charles Norris Cochrane. Clarendon Press. 30s.

The obvious points of resemblance between the period of the eclipse of Rome and the days in which we live have called forth more than one study of the later Empire in which the *arrière pensée* is not far to seek. In Mr Cochrane's impressive work the "modern instances" are hardly below the surface, and it is fairly clear that the author has the contemporary situation always in mind. By the clever device of constantly using modern catchwords, such as "totalitarian," "new deal" and the like, the reader in his turn is not allowed to forget that he is hearing of things which may vitally concern his own peace. At first irritating, because it seems merely a dodge to give the book a meretricious appeal, this habit of Mr Cochrane's ends by becoming attractive, until one feels constrained to abjure, at least in part, the purist (and perhaps over-fastidious) dogma that history should be a sternly abstract science. [We confess, though, that our conversion has not extended so far as to make us welcome some of Mr Cochrane's coinages—or are they Americanisms?—*e.g.*, "morselization" (p. 190), "obligated to" (p. 302), whilst "reification" (p. 450) frankly defeats us!]

It is centuries too soon to say whether the parallels which can be drawn plentifully and easily between the age of Rome's decline and fall and what, if Berdyaev is right, is "the end of our time" are real or merely superficial. But that does not make the analogy any the less worth drawing, and, in any case, illustrations from contemporary affairs are the best means to make history vivid, as every lecturer knows. Nor need they hinder objectivity and exactitude if used as carefully and unobtrusively as are Mr Cochrane's. Human problems do not change so much as the different forms under which they present themselves in different ages would suggest, so that, without subscribing to a grossly utilitarian valuation of historical studies, we can commend this book to the general reader as not without a strong topical interest.

The title and sub-title of the work explain its scope fairly precisely and show that it is one more attempt to evaluate the complex and ambiguous relations between Christianity and the ideology of the classical world in the period between their first meeting and the fourth century conquest of the Roman Empire by the Christian Church. Beginning with an interesting examination of the ideals of the Augustan Empire and the values it tried to conserve from the Græco-Roman past, the book goes on to deal with the new situation brought about by

the conversion of Constantine and the state establishment of Christianity begun then and completed by Theodosius, complicated as it was by the simultaneous need to try to hold together, by means of a military totalitarianism, what Augustine graphically called " a rotting and disintegrating world " (p. 508). Finally, in a third section, we have a study of the fourth-century Christian *Weltanschauung* as illustrated by Athanasius and Augustine; this is treated with an understanding and respect which betray the author's sympathies and is shown to be fundamentally incompatible with the classical view of life, which was vitiated by its pagan presuppositions and could have had no future even in a world which was not turning more and more to the Christian revelation, as the fourth century was.

The central plan of the book is finely conceived and executed with great learning and considerable literary skill. Nevertheless the main theses are by no means easy to follow, partly because of the rather diffuse and difficult style, and partly because of the author's habit of following some train of thought in which he has become interested to the bitter end in great detail, even when, as not infrequently, it leads him from the immediate point (as in the long, if interesting, discussion of the historiographical theories of Herodotus which occupies pp. 456-468). Mr Cochrane's work thus gives almost the impression of a series of monographs loosely woven together. We think it would benefit both from a moderately hot Turkish bath and from a rearrangement, which might give an opportunity for introducing a wider range of examples of Christian and pagan thought; for, as it stands, the book tends to gravitate round a series of a few selected great figures—Cicero, St Augustine, Julian and others. *Vixerunt fortes ante—et post—Agamemnona.* Mr Cochrane's method of treatment is almost suggestive of a Carlylean view of history, though it is really due to an inveterate habit of using sources one by one instead of in combination.

Though not, we should judge, a professional theologian, Mr Cochrane avoids most of the pitfalls which beset the adventurer into this dangerous *terra incognita*, though on p. 241 the account given of the orthodox doctrine of original sin is confused and some expressions verge perilously near to Pelagianism.

THOMAS M. PARKER.

AL-AŠʿARĪ'S AL-IBĀNAH ʿAN UṢŪL AD-DIYĀNAH (THE ELUCIDATION OF ISLAM'S FOUNDATION). A Translation with Introduction and Notes by Walter C. Klein. American Oriental Series, Vol. XIX. American Oriental Society, New Haven, Connecticut. $2.00.

Al-Aš'arī (d. A.D. 935), the founder of orthodox scholasticism in Islām, is reputed by tradition to have been a prolific writer.

Not more than seven of his works are, however, now known to exist. One of these is the *Ibānah*. Dr Klein's edition of it consists of a brief preface; three introductory chapters on the first three centuries of Islām, on the Mu'tazilah, and on Al-Aš'arī and his theology (pp. 1-38); a bibliography of Arabic and European works (pp. 39-42); a translation of the Arabic text (pp. 43-136); three indices (of Arabic words, proper names, and Qur'ānic citations and references, pp. 137-143); and copious footnotes throughout.

Excellent though the introductory chapters and the notes are, it is Dr Klein's translation which gives to his work a special interest and importance. For this is the first occasion on which the whole of the *Ibānah* has been translated into a modern language. For his translation Dr Klein has followed the divisions and the text of the Cairo edition (A.H. 1348=A.D. 1929), which he describes as " critical—at least, according to Oriental standards " and " sound enough for practical purposes " (p. 39). He has also used the other printed edition, published in Hyderabad in A.H. 1321 (=A.D. 1903), and has called attention in the footnotes to all the variant readings in it that seem worthy of consideration. The present reviewer, who has used the Hyderabad text, the only one available to him, has tested the translation over a large part of the work and has found it accurate. Where the rendering is colloquial, it is of the author's set purpose, and is due to his desire to express as fully as possible the character of the original.

Dr Klein's primary aim in his preparation of this edition of the *Ibānah* is to advance the studies of the specialist. This he can be said certainly to have done. He has, however, a further aim—he hopes that his work will serve to introduce the resourceful intricacies of Muslim theology to the non-expert also, particularly to the Christian theologian. It may be of interest to readers of this journal if the contents of the *Ibānah* are briefly indicated. The main subjects of discussion are: the visibility of God to sight in the next world; the Qur'ān as the uncreated word of God; the question of God's being seated on the throne; God's face, eyes, sight, hands; His knowledge, power, and attributes in general; His will; the predestination of the works of human beings; the punishment of the grave; and the imamate of Abu Bakr the Veracious. The *Ibānah* is not, as the enumeration of these subjects might suggest, a systematic treatise. It is rather " an arsenal of arguments, capable of use as a manual of telling replies to the unorthodox " (p. 29).

One part of his task Dr Klein has, through considerations of time and expense, been compelled to leave undone—namely, a critical study of the manuscripts of the *Ibānah* (see p. 39). That this may some time be undertaken will be the wish of all serious students of Islām.

D. Winton Thomas.

THE FALL OF THE IDOLS. By W. R. Inge. Putnam. 8s. 6d.

Dr Inge fervently believes in the objective existence of a realm of absolute values, devotion to which constitutes salvation. Of these absolute values truth is one. Now I find it extremely difficult to reconcile this book with devotion to truth; for it is a mixture of incompatibles. Tangled with profound insight are infantile prejudices, gross misrepresentation and slapdash superficiality. A veritable ragbag with an occasional gem. The few gems are of "purest ray serene." It is well worth while to persevere with the junk for the sake of the gems. Let me illustrate.

First, the prejudices. When Dr Inge sees the word "Marx," the rationality he so much extols vanishes, and he writes nonsense such as Colonel Blimp might be ashamed of. Marx's real name, it seems, was Mordecai (p. 156). There is no reference. Dr Inge says so. He dismisses *Das Kapital* as "a monument of pretentious pedantry" on the authority of H. G. Wells, who has not shown evidence that he has ever read it. Marx also was "confused" (p. 156). Now there are many charges which can justly be levelled against *Das Kapital*. But the one charge that cannot possibly be made by anyone who has studied it is that it is "confused." It is abstract, involved, anything you like. But not "confused."

Dr Inge evinces the same irrational prejudice whenever he writes on Socialism and Left-Wing politics. His pages on Spain are fantastic (pp. 72-73). He gives lumps of figures of people murdered by the "Reds" without a single reference, and then proceeds to say that nothing would be easier than to give examples. "But one example will suffice," and then adduces the exploded story of Helen Nicolson about the crucifixion of the Malaga male bourgeoisie and the raping of their wives and daughters. Not a word about the Basque priests murdered by Franco. What has truth to do with all this dreadful travesty? Dr Inge assures us (p. 251) that he believes in the authority of science in its own field. Does he call this way of dealing with political and economic problems scientific?

Second, his misrepresentation of opponents is appalling. Relying on Professor Hearnshaw's *A Survey of Socialism*, he gives a string of quotations to show the attitude of Socialists to current problems (pp. 157-158), every one of which is taken from the writings of G. D. H. Cole and W. Mellor in their syndicalist phase *twenty-two years ago*, which both writers have long since abandoned, and which was always strenuously and successfully resisted by the vast majority of the Labour Movement. Even the Trade Union section rejected it lock, stock and barrel. How can one describe this except as a gross betrayal of truth? Dr Inge represents the opinion of a tiny minority (an opinion no longer believed in by that minority) as the belief of the majority which always repudiated it.

Third, Dr Inge is very slapdash with his " felicitous " quotations—*e.g.*, he quotes Dr Arnold Toynbee (*A Study of History*, vol. iv) as rejecting completely the view that history moves in cycles. But in the same volume Dr Toynbee states that there is an element of truth in it (*vide ibid.*, p. 34). Dr Inge also quotes Herbert Spencer as an apostle of inevitable progress. But he does not inform his readers that Spencer became disillusioned before he died. I herewith present Dr Inge with a fresh quotation from Spencer. " Now that the white savages of Europe are overrunning the dark savages everywhere; now that the European nations are vying with one another in political burglaries; now that we have entered upon an era of social cannibalism in which the strong nations are devouring the weaker; now that national interests, national prestige, pluck and so forth are alone thought of, and equity has utterly dropped out of thought, while rectitude is scorned as 'unctuous,' it is useless to resist the wave of barbarism. There is a bad time coming, and civilized mankind will (morally) be uncivilized before civilization can again advance. . . . The universal aggressiveness and universal culture of blood-thirst will bring back military despotism, out of which after many generations partial freedom may again emerge."[1]

If the reader can survive the asphyxiating fumes of Dr Inge at his irrational worst, he will be rewarded with a profound and brilliant demonstration of how modern man's idols have been toppled from their pedestals. He shows very convincingly how events have falsified men's hopes in Progress, Democracy, and what he calls Economism, the ideal of merely material consumption. It must be recognized and appreciated that Dr Inge is only doing now, in a day of disaster, what he did in the day of seeming prosperity, when he was a lone prophet. But history has moved so rapidly that Dr Inge's exposure has itself become unsatisfactory.

I can best explain what I mean by pointing out, what he does not seem to realize, that among the fallen idols is his own pet idol, Platonism, which, says Dr Inge, " in its Christianized form . . . needs only to be accepted as the faith of the nation for most of our social maladies to be cured " (p. 241). In his deepest assumptions Dr Inge is at one with his opponents (whom he exposes so brilliantly here) in believing that it is within human compass to cure its own social ills. Just accept Platonism (Christianized), and you will be saved.

" Christianized Platonism " is a fundamental confusion. The essence of New Testament Christianity, surely, is that there is no way to God from man. By no effort whatsoever can man, fallen and sinful, build a bridge, from the human end, to span the abyss separating him from God. The one and only way to

[1] *Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer*, pp. 410-411.

God is the way God Himself has ordained: His gift of Himself in Christ. Man must by faith appropriate that gift. God's love (Agape) is the only way by which man can be reconciled to God. The essence of Platonism is that by his own love (Eros) man can ascend to God. The New Testament says that God has descended to man (Agape); Platonism says that man can ascend to God (Eros). Those two—the absolutely ultimate Either/Or—can no more be synthesized than light and darkness. You can Christianize Platonism only by abolishing it. The greatest obstacle to Christ in Judaism was the Torah; the greatest obstacle to Christ in philosophy is Platonism. Man must choose between Agape and Eros. He cannot have both.

Of this final issue Dr Inge shows no gleam of awareness in this book. On the contrary, he writes about the Incarnation as an addition to Platonism (p. 241). What History is doing now is demonstrating the inadequacy, not merely of Democracy, Progress, and the rest of Dr Inge's fallen idols, which, after all, are mere manifestations. It is doing something much more searching and tragic: it is demonstrating the inadequacy of the greatest of all fallen idols, Man, with his most persistent illusion that he can by his own Eros rise to God. Not possible.

It may be a bitter comment, but Dr Inge, who for so long was so far ahead of History, has been overtaken by the accumulating tragedy of events. Our generation will have to mourn the loss of very much more serious things than the English country house of Dr Inge's lamentation. D. R. Davies.

A Church Genuinely Catholic. By Clement F. Rogers. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Professor Rogers' new book is written in the light of the two convictions that " the Divinity of our Lord (is) the one central hope of our poor wayward race " and that " the Christianity that is to meet the needs of men must be that of an organized Church, broad based on the past, in touch with life at all points, and calling both learned and simple to its service; in fact, ' a Church genuinely Catholic '."

The first part of the book is an historical survey in which the author describes the characteristics of the four main types of Christian faith and order—the Jewish, Greek, Roman, and English. None of these is perfect in itself, each has much to learn from the others, and the time is yet to be when the four strands will be woven together to form the pattern of the complete Catholicism. The Jews have given us the Scriptures, provided in the Psalter the backbone of our liturgical worship, laid the foundations of moral theology, and taught us to believe in a personal and living God who intervenes in the historical process. The Greeks have helped us to clarify our thought about the nature of man, have

formulated the creeds and provided the technical language of theology, organized asceticism, and made possible a concordat between the totalitarian claims of religion and the human thirst for culture. The Latin genius has been for order and assimilation, and the Roman Church has done more than any other to guide individuals in the life of prayer. The religion of the English Church in the last four hundred years has been characterized by flexibility, variety, and a real belief in freedom. The value of this part of the book is unequal. The material is familiar enough already, and the treatment is too brief to avoid the dangers of over-simplification. The tribute to the genius and achievements of the Roman Catholic Church is very handsome, and the estimate of the strength and more particularly the weaknesses of the present-day Church of England very frank. He notes—and any parish priest will bear him out—the lack of any sense of obligation amongst the rank and file of its members, the absence of a real understanding of Eucharistic worship, its uncertainty in moral teaching, and its neglect of some important parts of the Catholic faith, notably the doctrine of the Communion of Saints.

In the second part of the book the author outlines the permanent, universal, and generally accepted elements in true Catholicism, showing how they correspond to the permanent, universal, and generally understood needs of human life, and how Protestantism has failed to meet these needs. Worship which is primarily liturgical and Eucharistic, ceremony and order, accepted and definite dogma, episcopacy, a definite moral code with an acknowledged way of interpreting and applying it in individual cases, provision for regulated asceticism—these are the necessary things which satisfy man's need to worship, to be redeemed from sin, and to live an ordered life and to think coherently. These elements are present, and these needs are met to some extent in all existing forms of Catholicism, but the perfect Catholicism of the future will be richer and more permanently satisfying. The book concludes with five appendices, all reprinted articles of the author's. Its most pleasing feature is the large number of quotations, which are sometimes interesting rather than relevant, but which save the book from dulness. For the theme is well worn, and the author has little to say that has not been said before. In fact, he has missed an opportunity. A fresh understanding of the nature of the Church is more than ever necessary, and there are movements to-day which begin to make that new understanding possible: the renaissance of biblical theology, the liturgical movement, the Thomist revival, the fresh and much more intelligent appeal to the Carolines—all these are significant trends in the religion of our day, but there is not a word about them in Professor Rogers' book.

R. Cant.

THE DULL ASS'S HOOF. Three Plays. By Ronald Duncan. The Fortune Press. 6s.

TOPICS. Ten Essays. By Walter Shewring. Hague and Gill. 5s.

Mr Ronald Duncan's three plays are in verse which reveals an original mind stored with a variety of sensory and intellectual experience. Mr Duncan avoids the faults of commercial writing—cliché, sentimentality, the stock situation—but, like too many young contemporaries, he has fallen into the opposite faults of obscurity, false cynicism, and deliberate eccentricity. The third play, a light political squib, is the most clearly expressed: it satirizes political parties, bankers, and bishops, and seems to favour agriculture and pacificism. The second play, described as " a miracle play within the order of the Mass," again contains a good deal of social satire. Some passages I failed to understand, but, so far as I can judge, the underlying philosophy is hardly Christian. The first play, *The Unburied Dead*, is the longest and most important. A miners' stay-in strike provides the main action, and it is presented with real understanding of the miners' point of view. There is also an underlying philosophical theme—the search for *nirvana*, I think—which too frequently comes to the surface and beclouds more obvious issues. In dramatic writing it is usually better that philosophical thought should be implied in the action, rather than stated in dialogue: Mr Duncan states his philosophy, and offends the more by stating it obscurely.

It is in the verse, however, that a basic insecurity is most obviously displayed. Diction oscillates rapidly between the traditionally " poetic " and the colloquial:

> Is his brave chest broken
> and his back busted ?

A good deal of the imagery adds nothing but confusion:

> Your tongue's acrobatics
> cannot cure
> my blood's bewilderment
> nor your lips alleviate or budge
> limpet, my love.

Would there be real loss in substituting the word " speech " for " tongue's acrobatics," and omitting " limpet "? And then why not write the sentence straightforwardly in prose? This is not a vulgar objection to *vers libre*, but a query whether some of Mr Duncan's broken lines are verse at all. Again, fustian is fustian, however renovated:

> I'd ring [*sic*] the earth's neck
> if the earth had a neck
> and if ringing [*sic*] its neck
> meant I had you. . . .

My first reaction to such a passage is to overpraise in contrast the poised propriety of neo-classicism. There is a wasteful strenuosity in Mr Duncan, which leads to unpleasant imagery (and occasional obscenity):

> Sucked lozenger of moon
> spat out.

This is not the imagery that permanently pleases. Contrariwise, there are curious, abstract periphrases:

> If she won't let my abundant blood's
> superfluity flow through her obvious channels. . . .

In a tense situation down the mine, prose is used instead of verse—at a time when really dramatic verse would be appropriate. This is perhaps significant.

I have spent this much space upon what I regard as the faults in these plays, not to discourage possible readers, but because I think Mr Duncan's work worth criticizing. If it is worth criticizing, it is certainly worth reading; and Mr Duncan's future writing should be of even greater interest. In it, I imagine, intellectual and technical difficulties will resolve themselves side by side.

Mr Shewring's essays vary in subject and importance. The first five, on literary subjects, are interesting and entertaining: one or two good things are said about religious verse in the Roman Catholic *Primer* of 1706, and about Hopkins. The style of these earlier essays is lucid and pleasant, but has at times a " literary " flavour which Mr Shewring himself would probably deprecate. The five later essays are wholly admirable. They deal with Distributism, the abuse of machines, and the principles and practice of education, both ideally and in the present disordered society. Mr Shewring writes with the clarity, common sense, and balanced judgment characteristic of a cultured Roman Catholic, to whom the realms of nature and grace are distinct yet complementary. He is a Thomist, and argues from first principles. His essays on education, including the teaching of religion, English, and the classics, have clarified my own ideas, and I have taken from them a number of hints for my future reading. These essays in education are important, and the whole book may be read with profit. It is also excellently printed, a real virtue in these times. I heartily recommend it.

S. L. Bethell.

The Collected Poems of Alice Meynell. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

The world of women poets is a small one. The fact that there seem to have been no great ones between Sappho and Emily Brontë is less staggering than it might appear at first sight, because

in any case the great women of history might be counted on the fingers of one's hands; but ever since the Victorian emancipation of the sex in this country, and feminine education has achieved its peak, the female poet has been rare. This has given to woman an exaggerated importance when actually she *does* appear as a poet. Christina Rossetti was always graceful and sensitively delicate. Her passion was finely tempered with austerity; but her genius was lacking in bulk, and her sheer creative ability was slender beside that of Mrs Browning or the Brontë sisters. Alice Meynell was of another calibre. She was of a humanity and ample-mindedness that, even if it was not great, puts her alone among women poets.

Thou art the Way.
Hadst Thou been nothing but the goal
I cannot say
If Thou hadst ever met my soul.

I cannot see—
I, child of process—if there lies
An end for me,
Full of repose, full of replies.

I'll not reproach
The road that winds, my feet that err;
Access, approach
Art Thou, Time, Way and Wayfarer.

This is no utterance of mystical ecstasy, but the humble voice of the Christian pilgrim; and it is rather a relief in these days, when creeds and ideologies are tearing the world asunder, to turn to a poet whose message is so often nothing more than a contrite reminder of " the things that belong unto our peace." For this reason alone we may be glad that the Oxford Press has given us a collected selection of her poetry. But Alice Meynell was no individualist. Her religion was the Catholic Faith; and to her water meant baptism, fire meant purgatory, and the English countryside God's wayside church. Moreover, she could say in a single morsel of words:

With this ambiguous world
His message has been told us. These abide
The signal to a maid, the human birth,
The lesson, and the young Man crucified.

For to Alice Meynell the Catholic religion was true—not because of its sublimity (though that had its place in her poetry) so much as because it was made of the stuff of which our hearts are made —its symbol was a Mother and her Child, its highest form of worship a meal, and its God " the young Man crucified." Even the glimpse of a world such as we inhabit now, foreshadowed in the Portugal of 1912, only wrung from her:

And will they cast the altars down,
Scatter the chalice, crush the bread?
In field, in village, and in town
He hides an unregarded head;

While in the corn lands, far and near,
Bright in His sun, dark in His frost,
Sweet in the vine, ripe in the ear—
Lonely unconsecrated Host.

In ambush at the merry board
The victim lurks unsacrificed;
The mill conceals the harvest's Lord,
The wine-press holds the unbidden Christ.

There is about this poetry a brave refusal to be disillusioned—easier to achieve in an age that preceded even the last Great War; and there is much in the poetry of Alice Meynell to hearten us and still our fevered nerves in this dark hour. For she stood out even in her own age as a poet of religious integrity, when perhaps only Browning excelled as such; and if we can forgive the rather ephemeral beauty of such pieces as *Cherries* and *A Thrush at Dawn*, we can see in her poetry the stuff of survival. It would probably be true to say that, of that little body of Roman Catholic poets of which she was a member—Francis Thompson, Coventry Patmore, and others—her poetry is the least derivative and consequently the most likely to endure.

Ashley Sampson.

Godfrey Day: Missionary, Pastor, and Primate. A Memoir. By R. R. Hartford. With a Foreword by the Archbishop of Armagh. Talbot Press, Dublin. 7s. 6d.

What constitutes a great man? Widely different answers would no doubt be given according to varying conceptions of greatness. Those who demand profound intellectual qualities, achievements of world-wide importance, or gifts of striking originality would probably deny altogether to the late Primate of the Church of Ireland any title to greatness; and Mr Hartford's memoir makes no outstanding claim for him in these respects, although rightly maintaining that Godfrey Day was not lacking in qualities of mind as well as of heart. But if greatness in one of its aspects consists in a life lived in accordance with the ideal expressed in one of Browning's poems, "I would love infinitely and be loved," then the subject of this memoir was a great man, and its writer has done a real service to the community in perpetuating the memory of a remarkable personality. The fact that Godfrey Day's greatness is associated with spiritual influence conveyed through personal contacts rather than with outward and visible achievements makes the task of his biographer a peculiarly difficult one; but Mr Hartford has successfully avoided the opposite dangers of indulging in vague panegyric, and of

producing a mere string of reminiscences. He has simply allowed his subject to live before us in the successive stages of college student, assistant curate, missionary, parish priest, bishop, and Primate. He has modestly sought the help of others when it appeared desirable, certain phases of the Archbishop's life having been entrusted to those best qualified to deal with them: thus Canon Chamberlain, who was his colleague at St Ann's, Dublin, describes in a graphic manner his incumbency of that important parish; and the Rev. R. M. Gwynn recalls his work as Professor of Pastoral Theology in Trinity College, several former pupils also bearing witness to the lasting influence left upon them. Mr Hartford has arranged with no little skill the material thus provided so as to form with the rest of the memoir a connected unity. Those who knew the Archbishop in later days will turn with especial interest to the chapters bearing upon his episcopate and his brief tenure of the Primacy. Here, as throughout his life, sympathy displayed in personal relationships is the predominant feature; but his biographer indicates also a remarkable change which became apparent on his appointment to the highest office in the Church in a new evidence of quiet strength and hitherto almost unsuspected powers of leadership. Two valuable appendices give the text of public utterances which show that the Primate's wide charity extended beyond the range of personal influence, and gave shape to a definite policy in regard both to Church and country. As to the former, we have his courageous speech in the General Synod when Bishop of Ossory, moving with earnest conviction a resolution for the repeal of that Canon which forbids the placing of a Cross on the Holy Table. His attitude to his country stands out in his first (also, alas! his last) presidential address to the Synod, of which we have the concluding portion wherein he stresses his desire to bring about a closer understanding between Irishmen of different religious and political outlooks.

The present Primate (Dr Gregg) contributes a brief but characteristic foreword, and his wise words spoken at the Memorial Service in St Patrick's Cathedral are recorded in full. It remains to be added that eleven illustrations, including photographs of the Archbishop as schoolboy, student, and curate, complete a book which ought to be in evidence, not only in every household of the Church of Ireland, but also wherever the conviction is held that, above and beyond the turbulent forces which seem to predominate in these difficult days, the influence of holy and humble men of heart such as Godfrey Day remains paramount—a conviction based on the truth that " now *abideth* faith, hope, charity, these three," and " the greatest of these is charity."

H. M. Harriss.

Eric Gill: An Autobiography. Jonathan Cape. 12s. 6d.

At the time of his lamented death in November last at the early age of fifty-eight, Eric Gill left behind a completed autobiography. It forms an interesting study of its author and affords his fitting memorial. He himself refers to it as an "autopsychography," and this is possibly the best description which could be applied to its narrative. Gill had done many things. He had passed through a number of varying phases. He was influenced and moulded by company and surroundings. But his actual life was not full of incident. It was lived quietly in the pursuit of beauty and in the waging of war against all that prevented the realization of the beautiful in life. Although he had no use for the "Art for Art's sake" school, he was in essence an interpreter of religion in terms of beauty.

The narrative of the biography is soon told. The son of a Congregational minister who took Anglican Orders late in life, Gill was educated at Brighton and Chichester. After a period of study as an architect, he adopted the carving of lettering as an employment. Sculpture followed naturally, and he became prominent as a designer of bas-reliefs. Among his works were the reliefs at Broadcasting House, those at the League of Nations Building at Geneva, and those of the Stations of the Cross at Westminster Cathedral. In religion, he was alienated from the Church of England by its cosy smugness. Fabian Socialism proved a path to Roman Catholicism. Having left London, he drew together a group attached to the Third Order of St Dominic at Ditchling, in Wales (where they occupied Fr Ignatius's old monastic buildings), and finally at Beaconsfield. His early work on lettering bore fruit in a later attention which Gill gave to typography, and printing owes much to his beautiful and clear designs for type. In his closing days he became the stern foe of the industrialism which he saw as the vanguard of the devil of ugliness. He also became an unrelenting pacifist and, even though he had served in the army during a few months of the last war, he was a foremost member of the "Pax" group of pacifists in the Roman Catholic Church.

Gill was essentially an individualist who had hewn out the course of his pilgrimage alone. It is impossible to argue concerning the positions which he adopted. They were absolutely his own and had been reached by his own introspection. His pacifism followed naturally from his reactions to army service in the last war. He admits that, as a Fabian, he felt the need for religion, set out to invent one of his own, only to find that he had invented Roman Catholicism. He swept aside theological controversies as too boring to discuss. He compares himself to G. K. Chesterton in that he had discovered the Roman Catholic position long before he was received with his wife into the Roman Catholic Church. He speaks of his sculptural designs as being the only design that he could do. He did not seek to copy a

model, but to reproduce his own reactions. It is this fact which gives to the much-criticized Stations of the Cross at Westminster their distinctive quality and which makes the art-student glad that the authorities could not afford a more expensive artist—the reason which Eric Gill gives for his appointment. His attack upon industrialism and commerce as ugly may owe much to the tradition of Ruskin and Morris, but it was again intensely individualist. Gill had the gift of looking within and then taking his stand. At the same time, scenery and companions affected him. The result was that he varied much from position to position. This fact gives the source of his real strength. He had the creativeness of the genuine artist and was ready to venture forth, not fearing the peril of change. Likewise, he had no respect for mere conventions. He thought the customary masculine attire merely silly, said so, and then sought to give his reforms a practical expression.

If it were possible to apply any label to these introspective reminiscences of Eric Gill, it would be that they are essentially a plea for Christian culture. It is for this reason that they form the best memorial which could be erected to their talented author. They deserve wide attention. They uphold the positions which Gill had fought and conquered in his own intellectual, artistic, and moral life, but they sketch out the ground which has yet to be won if Christianity is to retain its hold upon the best cultural forces of the nation. It will certainly not do so by means of the religious fustiness which repelled Gill from his early allegiances.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

SHORTER NOTICES

The present seven books, which were sent to be reviewed together, have no single theme running through them; but each of them may well be examined for the help it gives us to think and live as Christians through the years of war and through the testing years of reconstruction which must follow.

For this purpose by far the most important is *The Hope of a New World* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), by William Temple, Archbishop of York. It first notes the faults in our present system which have led to this war. The ultimate cause is the neglect by all nations of God and His laws. For at least half a century there was increasing tendency in civilized countries to regard " God and faith in God as an optional extra to be added according to the taste when the requirements of a decent human life had been met " (p. 10). With this naturally went a corresponding decline in attempting to live a disciplined life in accordance with the will of God. It was " a signal mark of decadence " that people

were " more troubled by pain than by sin, by suffering than by moral evil " (p. 64). There were many symptoms of this weakness. Many of us did our daily work " so as to earn the means of enjoying ourselves when it was done: but that enjoyment was what we really lived for—not for service to the common good that we gave through our work " (p. 15). Part of the reason for shirking our share of the burden of maintaining international order was our reluctance to face higher taxation to cover the cost of rearmament and our unwillingness for the discipline and discomfort of general military training.

So comes the appeal for penitence. Perhaps this need might have been stressed a little more. It is noted how little sense of sin there is at the present time. The author here points out that through the widespread sense of frustration men may be led to sincere and ever-deepening penitence. To do so we need to show that we unduly narrow the meaning of sin if we confine it to " acts done in spite of knowledge that they are wrong. Sin in the New Testament has a far wider meaning than this: it is everything about us which is other than God would have it to be; it is all that falls short of the glory of God. The heart of it in man is his self-centredness, the putting of himself into the centre where only God should be " (p. 109).

Along with this deepening of penitence, the Archbishop calls for the vigorous prosecution of the war. " We are not fighting for Christianity," but for freedom, so that after the war we may be able to try to rebuild on Christian principles. By freedom is meant not freedom from discipline, for there was too much of that in England before the war; but freedom of conscience, which is denied to the subjects of totalitarian states. The purpose of our struggle " is not freedom to do what I choose or to fulfil my own purpose, but freedom to do what I ought and to fulfil God's purpose for me " (p. 23).

This leads to an excellent demonstration of the necessity of worship. When we worship we take up our only right place as creatures before their Creator, sons before their Father. By regular sincere worship our minds and wills should be brought nearer to permanence in this attitude. So by degrees we bring to the problems of war and peace characters and abilities all God-centred and God-directed. This book's treatment of prayer (pp. 26-35) and the Eucharist (pp. 69-71) is very valuable.

In addition Dr Temple has some quite definite proposals for our future international and domestic policy. It will be well to note the tone in which these suggestions are put forward. " I offer these proposals not as dogmas, but as matter for discussion and as indications of a spirit rather than as a definite policy. It may be that there are other and better ways of attaining our object " (p. 56).

Yet there is a danger that this excellent book might lead some

to suppose that international and social reconstruction is the chief work of the Church. Baron von Hügel, commenting on a book published by Dr Temple in the last war, wrote: " Very certainly the Church has to help in the amelioration of *this* life," but its " primary end and function is . . . the awakening souls to, the preparing them for, the holding before them the embodiments of *the other life*, the life beyond the grave " (*Selected Letters*, p. 220).

Basil Mathews in the *Supreme Encounter* (S.C.M., 6s.) attempts to discover by the modern critical study of the Bible the purpose and method of God in the course of history, and then in this light to interpret the modern situation. The author's main theme is seen in these words: " Again and again we see man in the static condition where a pattern of life has reached fulfilment within its own limits of capacity. Then the Adversary breaks in, disturbing and destroying, yet in that very process opening the way for the Creator to direct and to discipline man to a new and higher plane of living " (p. 17).

There is much in this book to help us to face our present crisis. Yet we are sorry to notice no reference to the Christian's duty of offering up his sufferings in union with those of his Lord to make reparation for sin. " I fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church " (Col. i, 24). This biblical teaching surely may help us to use the sufferings of war-time.

Clearly the hope of a better order depends to a considerable extent on the growth of the Christian Church in all parts of the world. Thus two books on Christian missions may well be considered here. We may find encouragement in the face of our great task of evangelization in R. J. Parker's book, *How they Found Christ* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). Mrs Parker tells vividly the stories of the conversion of sixteen Indian Christians of the last century, nearly all of whom had to overcome almost insuperable obstacles of caste and family ties.

L. Levonian in *Islam and Christianity* (Allen and Unwin, 6s.) pleads for a more sympathetic approach to Islam by Christians. He holds that unnecessary misunderstandings have arisen through unnoticed differences in their terminologies and through inaccurate statements about their historical relationships. For example, when the Christian says that " God is Spirit," the Moslem is repelled because he uses spirit (" rūh ") in the quasi-material sense. The author also provides evidence that Moslems, before the time of the Crusades, were more tolerant to Christians than is usually supposed, and that Christians have a good deal to repent of in the policies of the Byzantine Emperors and of the Crusaders.

Professor Saurat has already written two small books designed to draw together the French and English. In this present slight work, *The Christ at Chartres* (Dent, 4s.), he describes " visions " and " mystical experiences " of a few of his fellow-countrymen. These records are of a very odd and unorthodox kind. He concludes: " Perhaps a religious regeneration of the French will come from stranger sources than we have dreamed of. Here is, of a certainty, much material to be shaped into forms acceptable to the Spirit " (p. 46). This book seems to us to provide very little on which to build such a hope.

R. S. Frayn in *Revelation and the Unconscious* (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.) classifies the mind into the conscious, the pre-conscious, the individual unconscious and the absolute unconscious. He distinguishes clearly between the individual unconscious with its repressed complexes, investigated by Freud, and the absolute unconscious, which, adopting the views of Jung, he holds contains primordial and racial memories. He attributes very great influence to this absolute unconscious in his survey from the dawn of human consciousness to the appearance of the modern dictators. The whole study is at present so hypothetical as to have very little directive influence in conduct.

The fact that many more will be killed on the battlefield and in our cities in this war should lead all thoughtful people to be prepared for death and the future life. So there is great need now of such books as *The Divine Crucible of Purgatory*, by Mother Mary of St Austin (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 6s.). This book is clearly the fruit of much prayer and study. It is far from being a work of apologetics, but rather meditations based on works of St Thomas Aquinas and other authoritative teaching of the Roman Church on life after death. Many outside the Roman Communion could probably find useful spiritual reading here, if they quietly leave aside any speculative paragraphs which appear to them to be without value. For wise advice on reading such a book perhaps we may quote von Hügel again: we should read with " sincerity concerning the insight we have " and with " striving to acquire further, deeper, truer insight " (*Letters to his Niece*, p. 23).

S. M. Gibbard.

Personal Religion and the Future of Europe. By Douglas Stewart. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

This book is a sound piece of popular apologetic written to meet the needs of " the decent fellow who never goes to church and has no time for religion, creeds or worship ". Mr Stewart finds no difficulty in pointing out that the secular state inevitably grows with the decline of the Church. Certainly Europe has not remained " decent, clean or just ", and Europe as a whole

no longer goes to church. Our author's thesis is that there is an organic relationship between the immoral society and the irreligious individual and that when the individual man severs his connexion with the Church he condemns his nation and civilization to moral impotence. Positively he argues that religion (*a*) creates moral realism, (*b*) provides the only moral standard, and (*c*) engenders an adequate moral dynamic. His analysis of our present human situation and our moral impotence is sound and telling, and his treatment of Christian Love, Faith and Hope provides the necessary element of construction in the book. We cannot have too much of this kind of popular apologetic, and we hope for a wide circulation of this interesting book. There are misprints on pages 20 and 81.

H. K. Archdall.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Allen and Unwin: B. Blanchard, *The Nature of Thought*, 2 vols. (32s.).

Burns Oates and Washbourne: E. Burrows, S.J., *The Gospel of the Infancy* (8s. 6d.).

Cambridge University Press: W. Perry, *Guide to the Scottish Liturgy* (1s. 6d.).

Christophers: S. Hodgson *Lord Halifax* (10s. 6d.).

C.L.A.: *Modern Tracts for Modern Troubles*, 5 titles (1d. each); V. S. Ellis, *Patience in Adversity* (1s. 6d.); P. Graham, *The Loveliest Lady* (2s. 6d.).

Dacre Press: A. H. Rees, *The Faith in England* (1s.).

Epworth Press: C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation* (7s. 6d.).

Hodder and Stoughton: M. Kiddle, *The Revelation of St John* (Moffatt Commentary) (10s. 6d.); A. P. Shepherd, *The Eternity of Time* (8s. 6d.).

Jarrolds: Ethel Mannin, *Christianity—or Chaos?* (7s. 6d.).

Longmans: C. Hollis, *Noble Castle* (8s. 6d.).

Manchester University Press: J. R. H. Moorman, *The Sources for the Life of St Francis of Assisi* (12s. 6d.); H. G. Marsh, *The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism* (7s. 6d.).

Mowbrays: Dom B. Clements, *A Monk in Margaret Street* (3s. 6d.); Bp P. Loyd, *Teach me thy Statutes* (3s.).

National Society and S.P.C.K.: R. W. Howard, *Talks in Preparation for Confirmation* (4s.).

Oxford University Press: C. R. Cheney, *English Synodalia of the Thirteenth Century* (10s.); L. Macneice, *The Poetry of W. B. Yeats* (8s. 6d.); C. Williams, *The New Christian Year* (5s.).

S.C.M. Press: L. Hodgson, *The Christian Idea of Liberty* (1s. 6d.); *Evacuation and the Churches* (1s.).

Secker and Warburg: L. Mumford, *Faith for Living* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Blackburn Diocese, *Pastoral Preparation for Marriage* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher